

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 1.—JANUARY—1910.

I.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF HEBREW
IN A THEOLOGICAL COURSE.¹

IRWIN HOCH DE LONG.

The three English Synods of our church, under whose supervision the affairs of this seminary are conducted, have called me to a specific work; they have called me to a chair of "Hebrew and Old Testament Science." The very designation of the chair indicates that Hebrew is not to be neglected. Instruction in Hebrew, according to the designation of the chair, is not an unimportant part of the work of the incumbent. Were the chair designated simply "Old Testament Science," such a designation likewise would not exclude instruction in Hebrew. In the nature of the facts in the case a scientific study of the Old Testament without taking cognizance of the original Hebrew could only be partial, superficial, unreliable, or even worse. The prominent and possible redundant use of the word "Hebrew," in the title of the chair to which the church has called me, is an indication to me that in our Seminary Hebrew is to continue to hold its time-honored and rightful position as a part of the important equipment of men for the practical Christian ministry.

¹The address delivered by the author, May 13, 1909, in Santee Hall on the occasion of his inauguration into the office of Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Science in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa.

Our church in this country has always officially acknowledged, as it does to this day, the importance of the study of Hebrew by its students for the ministry. In this service, on the present occasion, the church through her representatives inaugurates one in her theological seminary, the avowed aim of which is to prepare young men for the ministry of today, into the office of teacher of "*Hebrew and Old Testament Science*." Furthermore, in the first constitution of the church in this country, adopted in 1793, the church officially demands that candidates for the ministry be examined "in the original languages of the Old and New Testament, to learn whether they are able by the use of exegetical helps to explain the Holy Scriptures." This was the position of our church on the question of the study of Hebrew in 1793, at a time when there were only two of the present one hundred and fifty-five theological seminaries in this country in existence, and, of course, at a time when our church in this country had as yet no theological seminary. In the constitution of the church, adopted in 1846, there are no such explicit demands made for a knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the candidate for the ministry. The demand for a knowledge of Hebrew on the part of a candidate for the ministry is however clearly present implicitly; candidates for the ministry shall submit themselves to an examination which is to "embrace all the subjects taught in the Theological Seminary." Now as far as known there was no time when Hebrew was not taught in the Theological Seminary. In the same constitution, under the specification of the duties of teachers of theology, we read: It shall be the principal aim of teachers of theology "to make the students well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures; to teach them how to ascertain the true sense of the sacred text." By this there is clearly meant that students shall be taught the original languages of Scripture, for to ascertain the true sense of the sacred text a knowledge of the original languages is surely one of the essential means. The present constitution of the church, declared adopted by the General Synod of York last May, also contemplates that students for the ministry shall be

taught the original languages of Scripture, one of which, of course, is Hebrew. It shall be the aim of teachers of theology in their instruction to theological students, among other things, "to make them well acquainted with the true sense of the Holy Scriptures." Again, teachers of theology are in this service required to instruct the students, among other subjects, in "exegetical theology," which clearly contemplates the necessary linguistic instruction. All this goes to show that our church in this country has always, up to the present, officially acknowledged the importance of the study of Hebrew in the preparation of its students for the ministry.

This official acknowledgment of the study of Hebrew in ministerial education is in accord with the theory of interpretation of the Bible which, according to Tholuck,² a prominent Lutheran theologian of the last century, differentiates and characterizes the two branches of Protestantism dating from the sixteenth century; the Reformed theory is grammatico-historical and objective, the Lutheran theory is dogmatic and subjective. The former aims to apprehend the sense of the authors of the Bible by linguistic, historical and other means, the latter is satisfied as soon as it has found some fruitful doctrine tending to the greater glory of Lutheranism, which leads

²"It has been conceded by many candid and learned Lutheran theologians—Semler, for example—that the theology of the Reformed Church has, from the first, done more than that of the Lutheran, for the cause of an impartial, historical, and grammatical interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. While the Lutheran commentators, as Luther himself, Melanchthon, Musculus, Chytraeus, Brentius, Bugenhagen and Balduin, made it their chief concern to prove the *Loci communes* of the Lutheran system, and to shed additional light upon them by doctrinal and practical digressions, the Reformed interpreters, Calvin, Beza, Zwingli, Bucer and Mercer, have from the first been characterized by a more severe method. It has been their great object, by aid of a thorough knowledge of the original languages of the Bible, and of the antiquities, manners, customs, etc., of the ancient world, to give a connected development of the real sense in the mind of the sacred writer." So Tholuck, in the article "Calvin as an Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures," in the volume on Joshua in the Calvin Translation Society's edition of Calvin's commentaries, pages 346 f. See also the original of this article by Tholuck in *Vermischte Schriften*, Vol. II., pp. 330–360, which is fuller than the above English translation from which I have quoted.

not to exegesis but to eisegesis. It proceeds in accordance with the subjective principle of interpretation, characterized by the following sentence: "of what text thou provest hell, will another prove purgatory, another *limbo patrum*, another the assumption of our lady, another shall prove of the same text that an ape hath a tail." In accordance with this subjective practice of interpretation the study of Hebrew is not cultivated primarily to apprehend the sense of the author or authors as is done in accordance with the principle for which, in general, the Reformed Church stands. This principle of interpretation of the Reformed branch of Protestantism does not allow of the wresting and deforming of the sense of Scripture to suit some subjective position of the interpreter or some objective system like the *Loci communes*, the "Institutes" of Calvin, or some other system, whether dating from the Reformation days or only from yesterday. That our church is still true to this sound principle of interpretation, in that it officially acknowledges the importance of the study of Hebrew in ministerial equipment is something in which we may and ought to glory. Our ministers in the Reformed Church are after the actual message of these ancient men of God, and one of the essential means to more fully apprehend it, we believe, is a knowledge of Hebrew.

Not only does our *church* officially acknowledge the importance of the study of Hebrew in ministerial preparation, but also, as is to be expected, her professors of theology acknowledge it. This is true, as far as known, of her professors in the West, and it is true of her professors in this seminary to a man. A few years ago, in a formal way, when entering upon my position of "Instructor in Old Testament Science," in this seminary, I called attention to "The Importance of a Knowledge of the Semitic Languages to the Proper Understanding of the New Testament."⁸ The main contention of that address was readily granted by every mem-

⁸This address was printed in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, October, 1906, pp. 495 ff. See also REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, July, 1907, pp. 326 f., note *.

ber of the faculty. If this is granted for the New Testament, how much more must it be granted for the Old Testament! Furthermore, at the request of the faculty, as then constituted, the Board of Visitors some years ago also made the study of Biblical Aramaic obligatory upon all students pursuing the regular course in this seminary. As far as known this action has never been revoked or annulled. A year or more ago a minister of our church placed the action of the Board of Visitors before me with the question: "I would like to know whether this action is carried out?" The action is as follows: "At the request of the faculty, the study of the Chaldee language was made binding on all students of the Seminary who pursue a regular course; as, without a knowledge of that language, they are not in a condition to read a portion of the Old Testament in the original."⁴

It appears then that our church officially acknowledges the importance of the study of Hebrew in ministerial preparation and that the faculty of this seminary feels the importance not only of the study of Hebrew, but also, at least, of Aramaic as far as the *Semitic* languages are in question.

Now let us look for a moment at the position of other theological seminaries in this country with reference to the importance or requirement of Hebrew. There are at present, as we have already noted in passing, 155 theological seminaries in this country. By correspondence with these seminaries on this subject it was learned last year on the basis of reports from 100 of these seminaries, (a) that 17 of the 100 have made Hebrew entirely elective and that there is a decline in the number of students for the ministry studying Hebrew; (b) that 20 of the 100 permit graduation without Hebrew, but require it for degree honors; in this class of seminaries there is also a noticeable decline in the number of students who are taking Hebrew; (c) that 63 or nearly two thirds of the whole number (*i. e.*, 100) require Hebrew of all students pursuing a regular course. These facts indicate that a lessening

* *Acts and Proceedings of the Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1880, p. 23.*

ing of emphasis is placed upon the study of Hebrew in the theological seminaries in this country and that the number of theological students studying Hebrew is on the decline.

We, the Reformed Church, who officially still give to Hebrew its proper place and emphasis in the training of our ministers, nevertheless feel the onrush of the advancing tide against the study of Hebrew. Our students as a body are doing perhaps as well in Hebrew as can be rightly expected of them. Nevertheless, they are made to feel, partly by this advancing tide against Hebrew from outside the bounds of our church, and partly by individual ministers within the bounds of our church, that the Hebrew is useless and that the time spent upon it by a student who is under preparation for a ministry that is "practical," "executive," and "social," is wasted. A student thus influenced by ministers against Hebrew before his coming to the seminary, refused to study Hebrew when he came to the seminary.

Now I have no fault to find with a fellow-minister of the church who thus influences a young man in his parish, looking forward to a seminary course, provided the minister is acquainted, as he should be, with the proper place that Hebrew holds in the interpretation of the Bible.

The study of Hebrew and of the Semitic languages in theological education is of more importance to-day than ever, due to recent discoveries that are intimately related with a study of the Old Testament, of the New Testament, and of the early history of the Christian Church. He who interests himself in any of these departments of study scientifically can not afford to close his eyes to this fact. Concerning the importance of Syriac for the historian of early Christianity, not to speak of its importance for the student of the Old Testament or the New Testament, one of the greatest authorities of this age in Semitic studies, Professor Nöldeke, of Strassburg, Germany, has said in this connection: "It is very desirable that theologians who interest themselves scientifically in the history of the first centuries of Christianity should learn

some Syriac. The task is not very difficult for those who know Hebrew.⁷⁵

Important as a knowledge of these languages is to the theologian who interests himself scientifically in his objects of study there are nevertheless a number of causes working together in this age which tend to a lessening of emphasis upon Hebrew in theological circles and in ministerial education. This is due to the fact that the objects of theological study are being more or less discredited and not given the same importance that was once attributed to them. Some of the causes at work which bring this about are new while others are old. Among the former may be mentioned the principle that made itself felt very effectively in every sphere of thought activity through the publication of Darwin's book *Origin of Species*, in 1859. The watchword now was "evolution," and the principle was speedily applied to the Old Testament as literature as well as to other departments of theological study. This created the impression in some quarters that the Old Testament is an antiquated book, the message of which has little or no relation to present day life. In the course of evolution, the whole of it, it is tacitly assumed, has been superseded.

In this connection it must however always be remembered that only by more or less covered tracks in the Old Testament is there suggested a development or evolution. Throughout the entire Old Testament there runs a strict uniform idea which is directly counter to the idea of an evolution; monotheism is found in the beginning; an advance is not possible, only a lapse. The student of the Old Testament who knows the Old Testament itself, rather than only books about the Old Testament, must admit this fact.

It was only the principle of evolution in the mind of the interpreter, who came upon these covered tracks and the disparate vestiges of substrata beneath the uniform surface that brought it about that the Christian Church in the course

⁷⁵ *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article *Aramaic Language*, column 285 f.

of time was quite generally led to regard the Old Testament from the evolutionary standpoint. The Old Testament itself does not on the surface want to be so regarded. This evolutionary view of the Old Testament is then a hypothesis which has a number of facts in its favor, but he who uses it as a working principle in a scientific study of the Old Testament must surely always be conscious of the fact that even could this evolution be traced more accurately and certainly it could after all at bottom still explain only very little. Why did not Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, who were also Semites, closely related to the Hebrews, with similar natural endowments, living a similar life in a similar environment, become the God of righteousness and the Creator of heaven and earth? Evolution explains some things in the Old Testament, but it does not explain everything, as those who study the Old Testament objectively in accordance with a strict grammatico-historical method must readily acknowledge.

Now, then, were it a fact that in the course of evolution the whole of the Old Testament had been superseded, a scientific study of Christianity as a historical phenomenon would still presuppose a scientific study of the Old Testament: *Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet, Novum Testamentum in Vete latet.* No complete or even adequate scientific study of the Old Testament for this purpose is possible without studying Hebrew.

We can go still further; even a mere antiquarian interest in the Old Testament, without any reference to Christianity, would still demand a study of Hebrew, the medium through which the message was originally made known.

To study the Old Testament scientifically without using Hebrew is about like studying astronomy scientifically without the use of the telescope or spectroscope, or zoölogy without the use of the microscope. I began the latter study with a text-book and no microscope; at the end of the year I had worked through the text-book. When I came to Franklin and Marshall College as a sophomore where zoölogy is studied in the laboratory with the microscope and actual specimens

under the guidance of the professor with no text-book, I, in my ignorance, thought because I had worked through a text-book, I knew all of zoölogy that there was to be known. Consequently, when I came to Franklin and Marshall I asked to be excused from further study of the subject, but the president of the college tactfully suggested that I take the subject as a review. I did so. Soon, however, I learned that I knew very little of the subject, and that little not at first hand. Through the use of the microscope a new world was opened to me and the knowledge thus gained became a vital part of my being. Now I contend that Hebrew will do the same thing for the student of the Old Testament.

Another cause tending to lessen the emphasis upon the study of Hebrew in theological seminaries is the principle that made its impress upon present day theological study through the publication of George Smith's book, "The Chaldean Account of Genesis," in 1876. This publication brought to the front another watchword, namely "comparative religion." The principle involved in this watchword, while not independent of the hypothesis of evolution, nevertheless has a place of its own. This principle also made the false impression in some quarters that the religion of Israel was only one, and nothing more, among the religions of mankind. "Van die godsdiesten is ons de Israëliëtsche één, niets minder, maar ook niets meer."

Most recently there has appeared the Pan-Babylonian school of Old Testament Study. "Some of the younger generation appear inclined to dissolve not only the Israelite legend but the history of the Kingdoms into a phantasmagoria of Babylonian mythology." The Hebrews imported everything from Babylon, including their religion and their God. Palestine, the land of Israel, is only "a small village" (Dörflein) which is to be incorporated into the community of Babel, the metropolis of Western Asia. The Old Testament prophets are said to be the "political agents," or "professional agitators" and "spies" of the King of Babylon. It is time once more for

the warning: "Chaldaeos ne consulito!" Do not ask counsel of the Pan-Babylonists!⁶

If the Old Testament in the course of human history has been superseded and left behind, if it is on the same level with other sacred books of mankind, and if its religion is not unique to Israel and is to be regarded as simply a part or small part of an ancient Babylonian astral mythology, why then shall a student under preparation for the Christian ministry to this age spend so much time in the study of this book and especially in the study of Hebrew, its original language? Such is the tendency these dominant present-day principles create against the study of Hebrew in the minds of students for the ministry and in the minds of some theologians.

There is another new principle at work in this age which also tends in the same direction. It is a certain type of sociology, adherents of which would not only remove Hebrew from the theological seminaries, but it seems almost everything else in the theological curriculum. Young men who wish to prepare themselves for the ministry of to-day should go to a sociological rather than to a theological seminary, or the present theological seminary should be converted into a sociological seminary. Some one suggests that "the minister must be better acquainted with the Church sons than with the Church Fathers, more familiar with Jim and Sam than with Origen and Chrysostom." Now a knowledge of present day life, social and individual, certainly is essential to a helpful and teaching ministry. In the same connection it must however always be remembered that sociology, important as it may be, can never take the place of Church history, and also that it can never take the place of Hebrew as long as the Bible is to hold its present prominent position in the pulpit and parish work of the ministry. Yet this is almost precisely what is demanded:

*Just as the manuscript of this address goes to press (December 14, 1909), Professor Clay's recent book has come into my hands. The book is a protest against the Pan-Babylonists and is entitled: "Amurru, The Home of the Northern Semites. A Study showing that the Religion and Culture of Israel are not of Babylonian Origin." I have not yet read it, but in this connection the title suggests a timely study.

"I cannot think of a single rational argument which can be used in favor of the study of Hebrew. . . . Let Hebrew be removed from the list of required to the list of optional studies; and then let those studies which have to do with the problems of life and society, in their modern conditions and relations, be given a large place in the curricula of schools for the preparation of ministers for their work."

Mention is to be made of at least one more principle that tends against the study of Hebrew. It is the spirit of making the preparation for one's chosen calling in life as brief as possible and to enter upon specialization before one is prepared for it by a comprehensive survey of the field in which specialization is to take place. Wherever this spirit makes itself felt as touching the ministerial profession there is little or no emphasis laid upon linguistic or other training for the profession, and wherever it enters the theological seminaries specialization is the watchword almost from the very beginning of the course. In a theological seminary course of three years there is no room for specialization and "original work." Three years are barely sufficient time in which to gain a comprehensive survey of the different theological disciplines, such as the Hebrew Bible, the Greek New Testament, church history, systematic theology and practical theology. Before this elementary work is finished special studies hardly have a rightful place. The best schools in other professions do not admit of such a policy. The school of law insists upon the candidate's attainment to a certain minimum of knowledge in all the main branches of legal science, and much knowledge of one phase of it cannot take the place of the lack of knowledge of another phase of the science; an expert knowledge of contracts can not make up for a lack of knowledge of evidence. The school of medicine will not graduate a man who has never studied anatomy, even though he may be an expert in *materia medica*. At the Military Academy at West Point and at the Naval Academy at Annapolis the student must undergo a comprehensive training in all the branches pertinent to his profession, and specialization is not encouraged until the student

graduates and is placed in some particular department of service. The theological seminary should likewise regard its office to be the furnishing of the most thorough elementary theological training, and postpone specialization to the time after the elementary and comprehensive course in all the main theological disciplines is finished. At any rate the theological seminaries ought to discourage the neglect of any of the main theological disciplines in an elementary course, whether it concerns Hebrew or some other subject.

Having now considered some of the prominent principles effective in the thought life of this age that tend to a lessening of emphasis upon Hebrew, shall we here in our seminary remove Hebrew from its curriculum? I hardly think that the Reformed Church is willing to take such a step. The removal of Hebrew from the theological curriculum is a much more radical step than I fear is generally perceived. In principle it is the beginning of the revolutionizing of the time-honored theological curriculum; it is the entering wedge for the ultimate removal of Greek, dogmatics and other subjects that now hold a rightful place in theological education. The removal of Hebrew will speedily tend to accelerate and intensify the movement against the Old Testament as a wholly antiquated book; it will tend to remove the Bible, at least part of the Bible, the Old Testament, from its present prominent position in the pulpit and parish work of the ministry. As long as the Old Testament is to us a unique book among the sacred books of mankind, as long as the religion of Israel is to us a unique religion among the religions of mankind, as long as we wish to maintain the time-honored theological curriculum and are not willing to have the theological seminary converted into a sociological seminary, as long as the Bible is to maintain its present prominent place in the pulpit and parish work of the preacher, so long we cannot on principle remove Hebrew from the theological curriculum, or even assign it an optional place therein. This is at the same time the answer to the question shall Hebrew be made optional or elective—not unless we are willing to make the whole of the time-honored theological cur-

riculum optional. The latter is not an unheard of thing among the theological seminaries in this country.

What may now be said more specifically without however going into details and technicalities, concerning the importance of the study of Hebrew?

The study of Hebrew affords an important intellectual discipline. This argument is to-day frequently used in favor of the study of Latin and Greek, but there seems to be a reluctance to allow validity to the argument when Hebrew is in question. Yet it is true, as a general principle, that the thought of another race, the racial genius disclosed in its speech, whether that race be the Greek people, the Latin people, or the Hebrew people, or any other people, broadens him who acquires the given language. There is also much truth in the statement that he who knows only one language knows none. A knowledge of the Semitic languages will bring with it conceptions new to the occidental, which he can hardly obtain from any language of his own family. There is in the grammatical structure the consonantal skeleton, forming the very bone and marrow of the language, to which vowels are added to give various meanings to this consonantal skeleton; the prevailing triliterality of words; the limitation to only two tense-forms with their peculiar use; the limitation to only two genders in the noun with its peculiar use to express case relations; the use of the pronominal suffixes; the almost total lack of compounds in the noun as well as in the verb; the marked simplicity in representing syntactic relations. Also from the lexical side of these languages it is to be observed that the student meets an entirely new vocabulary, essentially different from any Indo-Germanic language. For a westerner to bring himself into sympathetic feeling with the Semitic means of thought expression implies considerable intellectual discipline. But studies for mere intellectual discipline belong to the college and not in a theological curriculum, and therefore we do not lay much stress upon this phase of the importance of the study of Hebrew in the theological seminary, where every student ought to be a college graduate, unless

there are good reasons to the contrary in individual cases. Were the intellectual discipline all, or even the main significance of the study of Hebrew, we would readily allow that it ought to be removed from the theological curriculum.

The main significance of the study of Hebrew is that a knowledge of Hebrew is essential to a fuller understanding of the Old Testament. This statement, self evident as it is, seems to be questioned by serious-minded men who are not unmindful of the fact that the greater part of the Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew. It is claimed that a better knowledge of the contents and meaning of Scripture can be gotten from translations than from such study of Hebrew as is now made in the seminaries in a course of three years. It is also claimed that those who faithfully use the English versions now in existence will come nearer to accuracy than those who study the Bible in the original, having only the limited knowledge of Hebrew obtained in a seminary course of three years. Be this as it may, we are inclined to question these assertions.

In the first place it is a general valid scientific principle that no literature or piece of literature can be accurately interpreted by means of a translation only. The scientific interpretation of any piece of literature dare not be based upon a translation of that piece of literature; the translation, if it is a good one and as accurate as possible, will and ought to be used by the interpreter, but the scientific interpreter will always go back to the original, no matter whether he is interpreting, Hebrew, Arabic, German, French, Spanish or English literature, or any other literature. If the scientific interpreter wishes to interpret, for instance, the *Arabian Nights* he will base his interpretation upon the original Arabic and not upon an English or German translation; if Goethe's *Faust*, then upon the original German; if Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, then upon the original Spanish; if the *Merchant of Venice*, then upon the original English; if Pierre Corneilles' *Le Cid* or Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*, then upon the original French. So one might continue and go through the literature

of mankind in every language, but in each case the scientific interpreter, wishing to interpret a piece of literature, would base his interpretation upon the original and not upon a translation. The validity of this general principle is readily acknowledged.

Shall we now when we come to the literature of the Hebrews make an exception to this general principle of interpretation? Can we afford to make an exception in the interest of truth and accuracy? Shall we, to whom the literature of the Hebrew people, or the Old Testament, is of special significance, base our study and interpretation primarily upon an English translation? Can the preacher, whose business in no small way it is to interpret and expound this body of literature, afford to study the Bible in an English translation only? Some, having no use for grammar and lexicon in Bible study, say yes; study it "devotionally," whatever may be meant by such study. If it means a study with little or no reference to the sense of the writer or writers, it is dishonest, and leads to false dealing with the Bible, and actually results in violence to the book. Such use of the Bible is no more to be condoned than the introduction into Scripture of later dogmatic developments. Again, if the "devotional" study of the Bible ignores the fundamental fact that man is a rational being, it is sure to issue in some sort of slovenly gush which exercises no wholesome influence upon the hearers. We believe that no safe distinction can be made between the devotional and the grammatico-historical study of the Bible, because the appeal to the devotional and intellectual is one. And, in fact, it is deep down in the fundamentals of the language, hiding away in the roots of Hebrew words and in the shady nooks and inviting corners of that language's grammar, that we come directly upon some of the richest spiritual treasures, pulsating in all their warmth, appealing powerfully to him who comes in touch with these pulsations.

If now we surrender Hebrew and hold on to the Bible in a translation only, we are in our interpretation forced to follow a method which is unscientific and contrary to the practice of all other interpreters, interpreting any piece of literature in

any other department of the world's literature. The Reformed Church, yea the Christian Church, can not afford, especially in this scientific age, to surrender Hebrew in the interpretation of the Old Testament and thus make itself a hiss and a by-word among the number of those who are trained to respect scientific methods and among those who from a mere antiquarian interest will always study the Old Testament scientifically. Hebrew, whether we acknowledge it or not, is and continues to be a recognized and constitutive factor in theological science the world over. As soon as the validity of this general principle of interpretation is acknowledged in Old Testament study, it follows that one can not get a better knowledge of the contents and meaning of the Old Testament from translations than by making use of an additional knowledge of Hebrew.

On the other hand, we readily acknowledge that a student does not and can not in the nature of the case, in a seminary course of three years, acquire a knowledge of Hebrew sufficiently adequate in all respects. He does however obtain sufficient knowledge so that he can examine a text of any Hebrew portion of the Old Testament in the original, critically pursue any topic of study in the Old Testament field and read with profit and appreciation the more technical literature pertaining to Old Testament study. Without such knowledge a man is not competently educated in theology as a science, no matter how much of philosophy and sociology he may know. These hobbies of the modern opponents of Hebrew in the theological course can never take the place of Hebrew, important as a knowledge of these subjects may be to the Christian minister. It is still true: "Ignavus in grammatica est ignavus in theologia."

Again, owing to the long and somewhat unique history of the Old Testament text, it is impossible for anyone to make himself adequately acquainted with the history or transmission of the text without a knowledge of Hebrew. For the scientific interpreter a thorough acquaintance with the history of the Old Testament text is very essential. In fact he must have not only a thorough acquaintance with the history of

this text, but he must be able by the means at hand to approximate to the original text; for the first concern of an interpreter is whether he has the original text of the author, and if not, he must obtain it, or where it is not possible to obtain the original text, he must seek to get as near as possible to this text by such means as are at hand.

Now our English versions are made from a text which was only finally fixed in its present form by Jewish scholars, called Massorites, who added the vowel points, accents, etc., in accordance with synagogal tradition between the sixth and eighth centuries of our era. Prior to this time consonants alone were written in Old Testament manuscripts, and the vowels were supplied by the reader. Now a consonantal text without vowel signs, such as was handed down to the synagogue, might have very different meanings according to the vowels supplied. Accordingly when these Jewish scholars in the Christian period, the Massorites, added the vowel signs, they not only reproduced the text itself, but at the same time their interpretation of the meaning of the text. It is this text together with its Massoretic interpretation that the English student meets in our English versions. That this text is not identical with the autographs of the Old Testament authors is well known to Hebrew students. This being the case our versions do not represent the text of the autographs; they represent the text of the Old Testament and its interpretation from the second century after Christ onwards. The Massoretic text and these versions are of *prime* importance, but the scientific student who is seeking to get as accurate and full a knowledge of the message of a given Old Testament author will always go beyond our English versions. Such being the case, a knowledge of Hebrew is important, even necessary, in this work of interpreting any given Old Testament writing, and the Old Testament can not be interpreted properly upon the basis of an English version. "Give a bright man only a year's seminary course in Hebrew, and he will be going back of our best translations with satisfaction to his intellect and profit to his soul."

In this connection it must be remembered that the whole of the Old Testament was in all probability written originally in an alphabet the characters of which are totally different from the present square characters. The present square character of the Hebrew alphabet dates from about the time of Jesus. Not only did the characters of the alphabet undergo a change in course of time, but the orthography likewise has its history; there was a certain kind of "reform spelling" already before the days of Jesus. The present word division of the Hebrew text is likewise not original, since the writing was originally continuous without division into words and interpunctions.

The interpreter of the Old Testament who seeks to approximate to the text of the autographs upon which to base his interpretation finds important help in the early versions, one of which (LXX.) represents a text some three centuries earlier than the Massoretic text. Chief among these versions in working from the Massoretic text towards the original form of the text are the following: (1) The *Greek Versions*, including (a) that of the Septuagint made in Alexandria in Egypt in the centuries immediately preceding our era; (b) those of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, all made before the time of Origen and now existing only in fragments. (2) The Latin or Vulgate, made by Jerome, 390-405 A. D. (3) *The Syriac, or Peshitta version* made before the end of the second century A. D. To use these important helps the interpreter must have in addition to his other knowledge a knowledge of Hebrew, not to speak of a knowledge of other languages.

Another help by means of which the scholar may be able to come nearer to the original Hebrew than either by our English versions or by the Massoretic text, or by the early versions, is found in comparative Semitic etymology and lexicography. Hebrew is a small member of a large class of languages, conventionally called Semitic. Some of these languages have preserved old meanings of words which have fallen into disuse in Hebrew or have become changed in the course of history. The amount of ancient Hebrew that has come down to us is so

small that many words occur only once, having neither brother nor neighbor as the Hebrew would say. They have fallen into disuse, or because of the limited literature, their meaning has been lost. In such and similar cases the only hope lies in the presence of such words in the kindred languages of Arabia, Babylonia or some other part of the Semitic world. Now no one would presume to make use of these helps without at least a knowledge of Hebrew. Old Testament science dare not as long as it lays claim to the designation as a science disregard these helps. These helps are made use of to-day in scientific interpretation of the Old Testament. The Christian theologian as preacher cannot be asked to do original work along this line, but he should at least be able to verify the work of specialists in this department of theology and to make intelligent use of this material which is the basis of modern interpretation of the Old Testament. To do this a knowledge of Hebrew is one of the essentials.

He who knows no Hebrew, whether preacher or any one else, can not in an intelligent and helpful way make use of the modern commentaries by specialists or of other excellent helps of a first-hand character. This at the same time also answers the objection against the study of Hebrew in theological education, that the preacher need not study Hebrew but should follow specialists. No one without a knowledge of Hebrew, as was just said, can intelligently make use of the work of specialists. Preachers of other denominations have repeatedly told me that they cannot make intelligent use of *The International Critical Commentary on the Old Testament* because of a lack of a knowledge of Hebrew. Now this series of commentaries on the Old Testament is pronounced by those who are competent to judge, to be one of the best series of commentaries on the Old Testament.

In this connection I delight to quote two paragraphs on the importance of Hebrew in ministerial education from that very practical man, Charles Cuthbert Hall, the late president of Union Theological Seminary. He says: "We dissent from the contention that Hebrew should be made elective, and from the conclusion to that effect founded largely upon the neglect

of Hebrew study by men in the active ministry. That such neglect prevails throughout the ministry in this country is scarcely to be doubted. Hebrew is not the only branch of learning increasingly discarded by men toiling under mechanical systems of church life that compel ministers too often to leave the Word of God and to serve tables. But even the voluntary neglect of the study of the Word of God in the original is not conclusive evidence of the inexpediency of requiring that study to be extensively undertaken in the seminary. Our contention is that the study of Hebrew is infinitely more than a linguistic exercise. It is the profound investigation of one part of the Sacred Scriptures, wherein divine truth is conveyed through the Hebraic medium. *The truth cannot be fully known by him who is to teach it until his mind has viewed it through the original medium of revelation.* In the day that Hebrew is made elective it will be rejected by four fifths of the men that enter the seminary; and the rejection of the Semitic discipline means the arrest and the decline of Old Testament study.

"For a short period the church would not perceive the consequences issuing from the decline of Old Testament study. But the logic of time would reveal them. We are entering an age wherein materialism will contend with superficial spirituality for the control of the church. The saviors of the church will be those who are filled with the very life and essence of the Word of God, and who have entered through toil and pain and vigilance into its profoundest meanings. The doctrine of expediency, which would relegate the severe study of any part of God's Word to the realm of choice, making it to depend on the personal inclinations of untrained youth, must, if it prevails, threaten the church with a deluge of utilitarianism which shall sweep out of sight, not sacred scholarship only, but the very landmarks of intelligent biblical knowledge."

We cannot and dare not surrender Hebrew, not only for the sake of truth and accuracy, but also for the sake of vital religion. We must maintain our connection with the primary sources. The ultimate source in theology as in religion is God who reveals Himself in manifold ways, but especially

through human instrumentalities. Through human instrumentalities He has revealed Himself and we believe that through human instrumentalities He is now revealing Himself. Accordingly there must have been a beginning of revelation, the originality of which makes it of great significance. Some of these first and original revelations in the minds and souls of the ancient men of God are recorded in the Hebrew Bible. There was also a revelation of God in Jesus, which to us Christians is of the highest significance. This revelation is also recorded in the Bible, and was likewise made mainly through a Semitic language, the Aramaic. The moment we sever ourselves from the Bible we break our connection with these primary revelations. As a school of theology which aims to prepare young men to bring the people of this age in close connection with God by using these primary revelations as one of the most prominent and resourceful objects of appeal, we dare not in the interest of a living religion sever ourselves from this revelation by neglecting the Hebrew medium through which it was originally disclosed.

A fuller knowledge of the Bible, gained by a strict grammatico-historical method, by a knowledge of the original languages, has done much in the way of preparing for a healing of the divisions in Protestantism, but it has not yet made its complete contribution. It will do still more in this direction, if the subjective or dogmatic principle of interpretation of the Bible will entirely surrender the dominance to a strict objective, historical interpretation gained by means of the Hebrew grammar and lexicon. This is the only way to come into a knowledge of Scripture where the emphasis is placed not upon non-essentials, but upon essentials in the Bible, in dogmatic construction.

The study of Hebrew in the theological seminary is urged not as an iron-clad rule which would exclude a man from the ministry for a lack of it; in individual cases for cause a student may omit the study of Hebrew. A man otherwise well qualified should by no means be excluded from the ministry. The ministry of an honest, righteous man, untutored in Hebrew, availeth more than that of a dishonest, unrighteous

man with the most minute and technical training in Hebrew or even the most thorough formal training in theology. But a righteous man with this additional training will be, we believe, all the more effective.

Nor is the study of Hebrew in the theological seminary urged for its own sake, but as a means. The aim is not simply to familiarize the student with a number of grammatical forms more or less obscure. The aim is to bring the student to such a point, where like a sensitive mirror, he receives and reflects the intellectual and religious content of the Bible, even to the most delicate throb. Or, to use another figure, suggested by wireless telegraphy where the messages can be read only through an instrument set to the pitch of the transmitted waves, Hebrew is urged in order to sensitize the student properly so that he may feel the very heartbeat of the Hebrew prophet and receive into his own soul across the long ages the minutest detail of the prophet's message, and that from his own soul, all aglow, he may in turn transmit it to his parishioners.

A knowledge of Hebrew in the study of the Old Testament, we are convinced, openeth a window through which light cometh in on the sacred page; it breaketh the shell that the kernel may be eaten; it putteth aside the curtain that we may look into the most holy place; it removeth the cover of the well so that we may come to the refreshing water; it is the rope and bucket of Jacob's well, which is deep, whereby we may draw from a fountain of pure water springing up unto everlasting life; it removeth the seal of the book so that when we are told: "Read this," we need not answer like the man in the book of Isaiah (29: 11, 12), "I cannot, for it is sealed"; it openeth our eyes, like Hagar's angel opened the eyes of Hagar, to unsuspected wells of water in all the vicissitudes of life; it breaketh down denominational barriers in Christendom and hasteneth the day of one fold. If a knowledge of Hebrew bringeth light, why then love darkness more than light? If a knowledge of Hebrew healeth divisions in the Christian Church, Christ's body, why then disregard the study of

Hebrew? If others love darkness more than light, shall we do the same? If others for a lack of knowledge of Hebrew choose to maintain divisions about non-essentials in Christendom, shall we too neglect this healing balm of Gilead? It is a grievous thing to neglect a great fair, and to seek to make markets afterwards. One must celebrate the seasons as they come around. If Hebrew may be tedious and the study of it requires time, that does not justify us to remove it from the theological curriculum, as long as we wish to hold on to the Bible and be conscientious in our interpretation of the same.

Through the synodical judicatories of the church I have been called to a specific work in this seminary; I have accepted the call. This day I am formally inaugurated into the office of professor of "Hebrew and Old Testament Science." I understand it to be my chief duty "to make the students well acquainted with the true sense of the Holy Scriptures." I am to lead them back through the versions as close to the Old Testament fountain as possible, for at the fountain the water is purer than at any point in its subsequent course. Students are to be taught to dip carefully and with judgment. Too rough and hurried scooping might yield only leaves that are floating carelessly on the surface, and, as is known, these quench no thirst, or such scooping might stir up sand resting quietly at the bottom, which is harmless and purifying in its place, but not so when you give it to drink. Leaves floating on the surface and sand resting at the bottom are part of the nature of a spring, which is a hollow in the ordinary ground, but open to the sky above. It is the water in the spring that gives refreshment and life. To teach how to draw the refreshing and life-giving water from the Old Testament fountain, with care and discrimination, so as to quench our own spiritual thirst and the thirst of humanity—that I consider to be one of the main duties to which I obligate myself this day. For the proper discharge of this duty, through no decision or act of mine, instruction in Hebrew will always be one of the important and essential means.

LANCASTER, PA.

II.

THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN A THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM.¹

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

You are now to be formally installed as a teacher of theology in the Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Science in this Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States. Your brethren, duly appointed for this service, are about to invest you with the rights and responsibilities of an exalted office, and you are about to pledge yourself solemnly, before God and man, to their humble acceptance and to their faithful performance.

Under one aspect your office and your work seem small and insignificant. We are not to-day making you a master of vast material resources. We are not crowning you a captain of industry. We are not setting you apart to lead men in their pursuit of fame or fortune. And those whose judgment is enthralled by material standards, who measure men by money and service by outward success, cannot discern the significance, the joy and inspiration of this occasion.

But those whose gaze penetrates the outward show of things, who in the fine phrase of the poet "see life steadily and see it whole," will realize, not only that to-day your church honors you by bestowing upon you the highest office in her spiritual domain, but also that, in so doing, she consecrates you to a work that is sacred, as God is sacred, and potent, as thought is potent, and permanent, as truth is permanent, and precious, as souls are precious.

In the providence of God every age has its own peculiar problem to solve. The pressing problem of our day is the

¹ The charge delivered at the inauguration of Prof. I. H. DeLong.

spiritual interpretation of life. Our age is the parable of the prodigal son writ large. It is rioting in abundance; it is reveling in a splendid civilization. But it is living its splendid, abundant life in a far country, where the abiding things, the eternal verities seem vague and lack-luster. And yet in the midst of plenty, men are starving; in its riotous carnival the world is sad and weary. Even now it is crying out, as of old, "I will arise and go unto my Father."

For that is the ultimate meaning and the essential significance of the bedlam of inarticulate voices that ring through our social fabric. Show us the Father. Give us a firm grip on God, that we may go to Him. And the imperative need of our day is of men who know the living God; not the phantom God of dead systems, but the living God, whose glory is seen in Jesus Christ. Him men would know; Him they will worship and serve. And in His service life will have its spiritual interpretation. There will not be a secular life then and a sacred life. But the secular will be sacred, and the sacred will be practical. Commerce and manufacture will be righteous, and righteousness will be religion.

And it is your exalted privilege to have a share in the making of such men. Whatever the technique of your work may be, it must result in the making of prophets, of men who know God, and speak for Him with the accent of authority.

But while, in the final reckoning, it matters little whether a maker and moulder of modern prophets teach practical, or systematic or historical theology, Old Testament Science or New Testament Science, yet there exists a peculiar and particular need to-day of emphasizing the place and function of your chair in the making of full-orbed spiritual leaders.

Doubtless, Old Testament Science may conceivably occupy a place of undue prominence in the curriculum of a theological seminary; or, in the hands of a pedant, it may become the post-mortem autopsy of a religious mummy. But it is equally true that the iconoclastic reformer of the theological curriculum, who would relegate Old Testament Science to the limbo of useless plunder, loses sight of the fact that in the Old Testament

we have an authentic and priceless chapter of the moral evolution of the human race. It is the spiritual autobiography of the religious genius of mankind, even as it is the gradual and progressive unveiling of the heart of God. It begins with the instinctive groping after God of primeval man, and ends with the God-consciousness of Jesus Christ. And even as biologically the twentieth-century man epitomizes in his pre-natal life the physical history of the race, so the spiritual life of the twentieth century reflects and repeats the struggles and victories, the hope and despair, the diseases and the recoveries of the Hebrews. Never will the world outgrow the messages of the Old Testament prophets; never will the heart of man tire of the deep strains of the psalms of Israel. They will forever remain the noblest expression of the faith and hope and aspiration of the soul seeking after God.

The church, my brother, is jealous of the traditions and associations of the chair to which you have been elected. For many years it was filled by a man whose instruction was an inspiration, whose memory will be revered and hallowed, and whose providential presence here to-day is a benediction. Your brethren are confident that his mantle has fallen upon worthy shoulders. Your unanimous election betokens their faith in your scholarly attainments, and in the sincerity and integrity of your life. You enter upon your work in the enjoyment of the fullest confidence, respect and love of the synods. Back of you stands a church that has faith in God, fearless faith in truth, loyal allegiance to Jesus Christ as the revealer of truth, and earnest sympathy with the honest quest of truth.

And thus, my brother, in the name of the Synod that elected you, in the name of the sister Synods that ratified your election, in the name of God whose we are and whom we serve, I charge you to accept the exalted office, which we commit to you this day, as an open door to an effective ministry to your time and generation. Walk with God; fellowship with Jesus Christ; seek to know, and to impart to successive academic generations,

the truth of God as it is in Jesus Christ. Then your influence will go with the heralds of salvation to distant places, and as each, in his place, shall humbly labor to bring men to God, and God to man, they will fill your heart with rich harvests of joy in recounting what God has wrought through them and through you.

ALLEN TOWN, PA.

III.

THE NEW TESTAMENT PORTRAIT OF JESUS.

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY.

PHILIP VOLLMER.

More than ever before the personality of Jesus is engaging the attention of scholars. All other subjects, the criticism of the sources included, have been relegated to second place. "What think ye of Christ?" is once more the paramount question. Manifold are the character sketches of Jesus. This variety is due to the individuality of the painter as well as to the colors used, whether taken from the New Testament or modern consciousness.

In this sketch we intend to follow the strictly exegetical method, and our aim is to reproduce faithfully the Saviour's portrait as exhibited on the canvas of the New Testament. In so doing we take the sources at their face value, firmly believing that all the gospels were written by men who saw Jesus, who heard his voice, saw the light in his eyes and caught the expression of his face and are thus absolutely trustworthy in their delineation of Christ's character. For clearness sake we will arrange the material according to the time-honored psychological categories, body, intellect, sensibility and will, being of course conscious of the differences of opinion under which category the various qualities should best be placed.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

No true portraits of Jesus have come down to us, and no physical characteristics of him are definitely recorded in the New Testament. Inferences have been drawn from various passages: *e. g.*, from Isa. 53, that he lacked beauty (so Justin

Martyr, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian); from Psalm 44, that he was "fairer than the children of men" (so Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom); from John 8: 57, that he looked older than he was; from John 18: 6, that there was an overawing dignity in his appearance. Taking into account our Lord's nationality and age, the customs of the times and the fact that the incarnation was the taking on of perfect humanity, we will not be very far out of the way when we picture Jesus as of medium height, dark complexion, a full beard, bright eyes, of dignified appearance and well-dressed (John 19: 23, 24). For, if the face of man, as a rule, reflects his soul, the features of Jesus must have, in a high degree, expressed the majesty and greatness of his spirit. At the transfiguration the inner glory pierced for a while the body which clothed it.

Unreliable legends know that Jesus sent by the hand of Thaddeus his portrait to Abgarus, king of Odessa, who had sent the Greeks to him (John 12: 20), and that Christ on his way to Golgotha impressed his true picture into the handkerchief of Veronika. There is also a forgery made about the twelfth century, a letter of "Lentulus, president of the people of Jerusalem to the Roman Senate," in which the following description of Jesus is given: "A man of tall stature, beautiful, with a venerable countenance, which they who look on it can both love and fear. His hair is waving, somewhat wine-colored; his brow is smooth and most serene; his face is without any spot or wrinkle, and glows with a delicate flush; his nose and mouth are faultless; the beard is abundant and his eyes prominent and brilliant; in speech he is grave, reserved and modest." This fancy picture has no doubt influenced the artists up to the present time. The Roman emperor Alexander Severus (222) placed in his lararium the image of Jesus, but no one knows how it looked. Eusebius (325) saw at Cæsarea Philippi a bronze statue of Christ, with the inscription "To the Saviour, the Benefactor," which Julian the Apostate (361) destroyed. If this was not the statue of an emperor, as Gibbon supposes, then there existed one supposed actual portrait of Christ before the fourth century.

CHRIST'S INTELLECTUAL POWERS.

The mental capacity of Jesus was truly marvelous. He was a man of limited education, but his mind was penetrating and active. As to his education, Jesus received only the common schooling, not a higher education (John 7: 15). Once only it is reported that he attended one of those scribal colleges, which met within the temple precinct, when after he had become "a Son of the Law" by confirmation, he visited the passover (Luke 2: 42). Luke 4: 16, mentions that he could read, and John 8: 8, that he could write. Like other Jewish boys he attended the parochial school, when six years of age. Because he had not attended a rabbinical college, the rulers called him "a Samaritan" (John 8, 48), which was a nickname for one who had never sat at the feet of the rabbi. His acquaintance with Hebrew literature outside of the Old Testament cannot be determined. That he was familiar with Buddhism is a hyper-critical modern fancy. He was a bilingual or plurilingual man. His mother tongue was Aramaic. Very likely, he understood Greek, for he seems to have spoken to the Greeks (John 12) without an interpreter. It is almost certain that he read the classical Hebrew. Jesus did not over-estimate mere mental training. It was perhaps when rejected by the learned men of his nation (John 10: 39, 40) that he offered up the prayer in Math. 11: 25.

The *penetration* and deep insight of Jesus was wonderful. He knew by a glance what was in man. He called Peter a rock, Nathanael, an Israelite without guile, Herod Agrippa, a fox, the pharisees, hypocrites and the Samaritan woman, by implication, an outcast. His knowledge of character is illustrated by the treatment accorded by him to each of the three would-be disciples (Luke 9: 57-62). Neither did his insight fail him when he called Judas for his disciple. Judas' moral descent was gradual. The *keenness* of Christ's mind is amply illustrated by his frequent encounters with the wise men of his nation in debate. He worsted them on their own proper field (cf. Mark 12: 28-34; Math. 22: 41-46). The people marvelled, saying: "How hath this man learning, though he

hath not studied?" Jesus' answer is his claim of divine revelation (John 5: 20).

A very conspicuous quality of our Lord's intellect was *breadth*. All other great men represent sectional, not universal humanity, as *e. g.*, Socrates was never anything else than a great Greek; Luther, a German; Calvin, a Frenchman;; Washington, an American. Christ was no nativist (John 4); he selected his disciples from all classes and of various temperaments and sent them to all nations. He embraces publicans and other outcasts. Over against narrow ultra-conservatism, he was liberal in his views on religious, moral and ceremonial questions, such as the traditions of the elders and unscriptural views of the sabbath. This brought him into constant conflict with his countrymen and eventually to the cross. Hand in hand with this broadmindedness goes what we might call his *self-limitation*, or narrowness, in the good sense of the word. His personal work, and also that of his disciples during his lifetime was to be restricted to the Jews only. He limited also the scope of his work, and refused, *e. g.*, to interfere in questions of inheritance, taxation, etc. "In der Beschränkung zeigt sich der Meister" (Goethe).

It has been questioned that our Lord was *original*. If by this term is meant that which has no organic relation with the past or the coining of new words, or startling ideas, Jesus was not original. And yet he made that impression upon his contemporaries. "A new teaching! We have never seen it after this fashion"—these were the exclamations. Jesus was original, (1) in that he altered the proportion of truth, exalting and expanding what had been previously neglected, *e. g.*, the fatherhood of God and the immanence of God and taking for granted doctrines as, *e. g.*, the unity and holiness of God; (2) he claimed a unique knowledge of God (Luke 10, 22); (3) he put new interpretations upon well-known truths, as, *e. g.*, when he explained Isa. 61: 1 in Nazareth; (4) he taught with a new accent of assurance and authority: "but *I* say unto you," so that the people exclaimed, "with authority he teaches."

All his teaching is pervaded by a "sweet reasonableness." Every sentence in the Sermon on the Mount is a classical expression of unparalleled common sense. How reasonable it sounds to hear him ask: Is not life more than raiment? Why mutter prayers and fast? Is not the soul worth more than the whole world? How reasonable is his test of truth, "If any man willett to do my will . . . , " and above all, that rule which on account of its supreme reasonableness, all the world calls "golden." Christ is perfectly normal, not eccentric nor erratic.

EMOTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF JESUS.

The strongest emotion in the soul of Christ was his complete *trust in God*. "He trusted God" said even his enemies (Math. 27: 43). His first and last words were expressions of faith. In the Sermon on the Mount, when he spoke of the lilies and the birds, and also in Gethsemane, he emphasized his confidence in the Father. This state of his soul Jesus expressed in his *habit of prayer*. (Luke 3: 21, 22; Mark 1: 35; Luke 5: 16; 6: 12; Math. 14: 23; Luke 9: 18-28; Math. 26: 36; Luke 23: 46.) We all know his longest, his most submissive and his last prayer. He prayed in public, in solitary places (mountains and in Gethsemane), for long periods (temptation), before important events (the choosing of the Twelve), and on the cross, three of his seven last words being prayers. He exhorted others to pray and taught his disciples a form of prayer. An atmosphere of *reverence* surrounds the entire life of Christ. In prayer, his language was not familiar but reverent, his posture showed respect. He cultivated habits of reverence; he prayed before meals, he was regular in attendance at the temple and synagogue services; he observed the passover meal, going through the usual ritual. This close walk with God spread over the entire life of the Saviour the spirit of optimism; not that brainless feeling which is often called by this name, but that strong conviction born of faith in God and belief in the possibilities of human nature. He saw the rocky element in Peter, he knew that publicans can repent,

and that the crown follows the cross (John 12: 32). "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," was one of his last words. He was an "incorrigible optimist."

The soul of the Lord was flushed, so to say, with a flood of *love to men*. No one ever emphasized the value of man as he did (Mark 8: 36; Math. 16: 26). He interested himself in the children, watching them at play (Math. 11: 16), rebuking his disciples for keeping them from him (Math. 19: 13) and declaring the child an example to his disciples (Math. 18: 2). This spirit of love manifests itself in our Lord's *sympathetic disposition*. The first part of his sermon at Nazareth sounded so gracious because it was spoken with deep compassion. With the exception of about eight, all his miracles are works of mercy. His throbbing heart is shown in phrases constantly recurring: "moved with compassion" (Math. 20: 34; 9: 36; Luke 7: 13; Math. 14: 14; 15: 32). Twice it is reported that Christ wept. He protected woman and therefore severely censured the lax interpretation of the divorce laws by the liberal school of Hillel. Physical and moral distress pierced his soul. He raised fallen women, even one living in adultery, and helped the poor man at Bethesda. He cried out to doomed Jerusalem and stretched forth his hands, saying "Come unto me." While embracing all men, he was *eager for more intimate friendship*. Even before the beginning of his public ministry he surrounded himself with special friends (John 1: 39). In the course of time, wider and closer circles of friends gathered around him by the seventy, the twelve, the three, the beloved disciple. But there was never any favoritism. He loved each one to the measure of his receptivity. He gave all of them his love (John 13: 34), his knowledge (John 15: 15), his example (John 13: 15). He loved many of them as special friends (John 11: 3-5; 13: 23).

Love has a large family of daughters. One of the oldest is *obedience*. This he had to learn (Heb. 5: 8). To his father's business he was faithfully devoted (John 4: 34; 6: 38; 8: 29). In his family, he was a dutiful son and brother, probably the bread-winner after Joseph's death. He appears

to his brother James after his resurrection and on the cross he makes provision for his mother. The address "woman" in John 2: 4 is not disrespectful according to custom and the idiom of the language. Obedience is a close neighbor to *humility*. He emptied himself (Phil. 2: 5-11), washed the feet of his disciples, warns them of the spirit of dominance, and enters Jerusalem on Palm Sunday on the humble beast of peace. The common people heard him gladly and flocked to him in large numbers; yet he remained meek and lowly in heart. When they urged him to become king, he refused. In all this he was absolutely *sincere* and outspoken. Hypocrisy he hated. He used plain words. He called the rulers liars, and Herod Antipas a fox. Closely allied to this virtue is the Lord's *candor*, which means whiteness, from *candidus*, *i. e.*, openness and frankness, without guile and craft. He never held back the truth. He told his disciples, "behold I sent you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Math. 10). Thrice he announced his death, when all expected a great triumph. His candor at Capernaum reduced the number of his followers materially (John 7: 66). He candidly speaks of limitations to his knowledge and authority, during his lifetime on earth (Mark 13: 32; 10: 40). In John 14: 1 he assures his disciples that they may always expect candor from him.

Christ was a *generous* soul. When he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," he spoke of his personal experience. He had no money, but he gave his time, strength, ideas, heart and life. Sympathy consumed his life blood. He pleased not himself (Rom. 15: 3). His death was a free surrender, a self-sacrifice (John 10: 17, 18). While severe towards himself, he was very *considerate* for others. He remembers the frailty of human nature and offers the disciples a vacation (Mark 6: 31). A large measure of *joy* and *gladness* was poured out over his entire personality. The painters represent him as sad and melancholy, but on friend and foe he made the opposite impression. The latter called him a glutton and winebibber, a boon companion of sinners, *i. e.*, light-hearted men. These slanders prove that he did not im-

press his contemporaries as morose. His friends tell us that he attended a wedding and various social occasions, that he discouraged fasting, compared himself to a bridegroom, declared that the child is the pattern for a true disciple, compared his kingdom to a marriage-feast and bade them even to express their joy outwardly: "Rejoice and leap for joy." True, the sources do not record that he ever laughed, but they mention twice that he wept because it was so exceptional. As a *friend of nature* he often speaks of flowers and birds, both of which are emblems of joy.

THE WILL POWER OF JESUS.

The *firmness* of Christ's character is very conspicuous. Neither friend nor foe could bend or manipulate him. He opposed false traditions and standards, repulsed Peter when he tried to dissuade him from going to Jerusalem, also his brethren (John 7: 3) and even his mother at Cana and Capernaum (John 2: 1; Math. 12: 46-50). He was little affected by the spirit of the times; he was a universal genius. In his teaching the element of firmness and certainty is very apparent. He was absolutely certain of the truth. He knew God had a plan and he also knew what it was. With manly firmness and prophetic clearness he approaches his passion. This characteristic did not repulse men. He was very *accessible* to all kinds of people: to simple fishermen (John 1: 37; Mark 1: 16), to anxious parents (Mark 5: 22; 7: 25; 10: 13), to publicans (Math. 9: 10; 10: 3; 11: 19; Luke 19: 2); to sinful women (Luke 7: 37; Math. 21: 31). His charm and magnetism increased his popularity. Another active virtue of Jesus was his *patience*, which may be defined as a calm waiting for something hoped for. He waited for many years till the Baptist arose. When urged to hurry on, he replies: Are there not twelve hours in a day; my hour has not come (see also John 7). Instead of setting Palestine on fire with a Messianic declaration, before the people were prepared, he asks, "tell no man," and after the transfiguration he says:

"keep still." The slowness of his disciples tried his patience, but he never lost it (Math. 15: 16; 16: 5-12). How patiently did he treat Judas, warning him again and again of the lurking danger. The cursing of the fig tree was not a lack of patience, but an acted parable.

The Lord's will power was surcharged with a glowing *enthusiasm*, which has been defined as being possessed by God (Luke 2: 41; Math. 4: 1). His friends considered him on the verge of nervous prostration and insanity and his enemies said he was possessed of a demon (Mark 3: 21-31). This quality drew like-minded men to him. Side by side in Jesus' character, goes undaunted *courage*, physical, moral and intellectual. He faces the mob, his traitor, the desecrators of the temple, the rulers. Notice his calmness in the tempest, before his judges, and at the crucifixion. He preaches unpopular truths at Nazareth, remains firm when many left him at the crisis in Capernaum, and dares to offend good society by disregarding conventionalities. He preaches good sermons to small audiences (Nicodemus, Samaritan woman). But this quality never degenerated into foolhardiness. Jesus was *cautious* and circumspect. Several times he fled from danger, for eighteen months he staid away from Jerusalem, after the rulers had taken official action to kill him (John 5: 18). After the meeting of the Sanhedrin on the Hill of Evil Council he withdraws to Ephraim (John 11: 47-54). Another manly virtue in the Lord's character is his *indignation*. He repelled temptation (Mark 8: 33); hypocrisy roused him to a flame of judgment (Mark 3: 5, 11, 15-17; Math. 23: 1-36); treachery shook him to the center of his being (John 13: 21); desecration of the temple angered him; perversion of the true idea of death aroused him at the grave of Lazarus (John 11: 38). He was indignant at the treatment the rulers accorded to the people. Indifference toward wrong is an unerring sign of moral deterioration. In Jesus, indignation never passed the limit, where it becomes sin; it was one manifestation of his love.

THE UNITY OF CHRIST'S CHARACTER.

Binding these various qualities together, what is the total impression, der Gesamteindruck, which the eye and ear witnesses had of the man Jesus? First, the gospels portray him, negatively, as a *sinless man*. This was his own conviction and the testimony of friends and foes: the Baptist, Peter, Judas, Pilate and his wife, the malefactor and centurion, the false witnesses (I Peter 2: 22; II Cor. 5: 21; I John 3: 5; Heb. 4: 15; 7: 26). He is intolerant of evil. He never prayed for, but bestows pardon. More than this: it is moral *perfection*, absolute goodness that he possesses according to the gospel story. "No one is good but the father" (Math. 19: 17) does not contradict this. There Jesus refused the attribute, because the speaker regarded him as a mere man. Both these qualities constituted his *spiritual-mindedness*, by which we mean the general bend of thought and motive toward divine things. He moves habitually in the realm of heavenly realities. Proofs of this are too abundant to be specific in detail. Jesus made the impression of *strength* and true greatness. The paintings which make him appear subdued and effeminate are not true to the colors furnished by those who saw him every day. By his power of personality he drew the good and repulsed bad men. The Baptist said, he is greater than I. "Follow me," he said to the disciples, and they felt a strange fascination which drew them towards him. The bitter hatred of his enemies indicates power, for we cannot hate a weakling, much as we may despise him. He claims *greatness*, but it is singularly modest and quiet. It attracts and never repels the well-disposed beholder. Even children seemed to have loved him. He was great in all things that pertain to perfect manliness, while others are often only great artists, great conquerors, great statesmen, but small men. In contrast with the jealousy, pettiness and malice of his friends and foes, Christ's greatness shines forth gloriously: Behold the Man!

An analysis of Christ's character, such as we have attempted, will in no wise do justice to the subject, even if it amounted to a complete catalogue of his characteristics, without mention-

ing the poise, the fine balance of faculties, the even proportion and perfect *harmony* of virtues apparently opposite and contradictory which distinguishes him from other men. Ordinary men are in constant danger of extremes. From enthusiasm they run into fanaticism and intolerance, from firmness into harshness, from mildness into weakness. This answers the question whether we can attribute to Jesus any one of the four *temperaments*. "He was neither sanguine, like Peter; nor choleric, like Paul; nor melancholic, like John; nor phlegmatic, like James. He combined the vivacity without the levity of the sanguine, the vigor without the violence of the choleric, the seriousness without the austerity of the melancholic, the calmness without the apathy of the phlegmatic, temperament" (*Schaff, Person of Christ*).

How do the writers of the New Testament account for this unique personality? Simply by accepting Christ's own testimony concerning his superhuman and divine origin and character—his coequality and coeternity with the Father, as explained in the first chapters of Mathew, Luke and John, and many other passages. On any other theory the appearance of absolutely perfect and sinless manhood makes a much larger draft on reason and faith than the Biblical accounts do.

Our task as indicated in the wording of the subject is finished. For completeness sake, it may, however, not be amiss to remind us that there are other portraits of Jesus. The ancient sketches painted by the Ebionites, Gnostics and other sects, as well as that by the Wolfenbüttel fragments, which make Christ or his apostles, or both common frauds and imposters are entirely faded and have to-day only antiquarian interest. The various liberal schools and individuals have mixed the colors furnished by the New Testament writers with contemporary philosophy and science and this accounts for the variety of their portraits. They believe that the true colors are to be found back and behind the glaring varnish with which the "dogmatism" of the Apostolic Church has covered over the real picture of Jesus. This varnish they call enthusiasm, self-deception, myths, legends and fiction. The pictures of

the liberal schools vary much, from the radicalism of Strauss, Renan and Schenkel, to the saner views of Keim, Harnack, Jülicher, Boussets, Pfleiderer and Frenssen. These learned men believe that they by criticism of the sources have discovered and restored the real Jesus, as painted behind the glaring church colors. And this, in general outlines, is his portrait: Jesus is a great man, but a product of his times, with the limitations of his period. He had sin in his nature, but he has conquered this defect. He was born like any other man; he never rose from the dead. The most modern portrait of Christ differs still more from the New Testament sketch. The men who employ the new religio-historical method of investigation reject both portraits of Jesus, that of the New Testament and theological tradition, as well as that of liberalism as unscientific. Between the two these radicals consider the portrait painted by the church as more scientific. The historicity of Jesus must fall, say Kalthoff, Smith, Jensen, and others. Jensen believes that the story of Jesus is an adaptation of the Babylonian Gilgamesh legend; and the two physicians Rasmussen and Loosten believe that Jesus was a nervous wreck bordering on insanity. With this, the most modern portrait of Jesus, theological science seems to have reached the limit, and the pendulum is already seen to swing backwards to saner and more Biblical conceptions.

Helpful literature on the character of Jesus are the following books: Jefferson, *Character of Jesus*; A. W. Hitchcock, *The Psychology of Jesus*; A. E. Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*; Maclaren, *The Mind of the Master*; Schaff, *The Person of Christ*; Grützmacher, *Ist das liberale Christusbild modern*; an article on the "Character of Jesus" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Gospels*.

DAYTON, OHIO.

IV.

THE MODERN DEACONESS.

DIACONATE OF WOMEN IN THE ANCIENT AND MODERN CHURCH.

G. A. SCHWEDES.

The gospel is the magna charta of womanhood: of her rights and privileges in the Church and the world. The Holy Spirit was heaven's gift to men and women alike. St. Paul insists that in Christ all are one, there is no distinction of class, sex or race. His letters make it clear that women were free to exercise the spiritual gifts, including prophecy, and enjoyed the utmost liberty at the services of worship and the Agapes. You need not read many chapters of St. Luke to find that among the Gospel narrators he is foremost in showing that women also had part in the Gospel story, and in his other book "the Acts," he makes frequent mention of them. St. Paul made his Epistle to the Romans a letter of recommendation for a woman, whose self-sacrificing labors had made her worthy of all honor. Harnack believes that the disputed author of Hebrews was a woman, the energetic and highly-gifted Priscilla.¹

Of the two offices in the Apostolic Church only the second was open to the gentler sex. There were no women-apostles, as there had been no women-elders in the synagogue. It was regarded a disgraceful condition of the Church in the fifth century when women-priests officiated at her alters. But the office of *Diakonos* was open to women as well as men; and if a faithful record of the Church's early diaconate had been kept, it would be found that Phœbe, Tryphena, Tryphosa,

¹ Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV., in article "Woman."

Persis, Euodia, Syntyche, Julia (I name only seven) had rendered helpful service in the Church and for the growth of God's Kingdom, even as Stephen, Philip and others of "the Seven." The diaconate is a fact in church-history, even as the ministry of the word. It does not follow the track of great victories as of world powers, but the quiet path of sympathy, love and mercy, often unnoticed save in distress, unseen save by the all-seeing eye.

The name which Fliedner gave to the office he established, shows that he did not regard it a new creation, but a revival of the Diaconate of the Apostolic Church. When St. Paul (Rom. 16: 1) speaks of Phœbe as a *Diákonos*, he refers to her as occupying a regularly appointed office in the Church; and by "our sister" he indicates evidently that the office was universally recognized. When St. Paul again testifies "she hath been a helper of many," he reminds us of the ministry in temporal things to which the original Seven were chosen, "to serve tables," *i. e.*, to minister to the bodily wants of the poor and sick. That St. Paul regarded the office as important in the Church, his cordial recommendation of Phœbe, and testimony to her activity, give ample assurance. There is however no descriptive reference in the New Testament to the deaconess office as such.

Another name for the office of helpers in the early congregations is that of widows (I Tim. 5: 9-10; Ti. 2: 3-5). Of this also no accurate description is given, and it is difficult to determine whether they were chosen to give or to receive aid. Doubtless there were many congregations in which the office of widows was occupied with the same duties which in others belonged to deaconesses. Both existed at the same time, and the different names were evidently applied to the same service.

The *Apostolic Constitutions*, written about 300 A. D. in Syria, mention widows and virgins not as an office in the Church, but as being worthy of Christian sympathy and benevolence. But the *Constitutions* clearly describe the

deaconess office with their duties in caring for the poor and sick, teaching and preparing women candidates for baptism.²

But earlier than this, in the age of the persecutions, deaconesses were prominent in the Church and fearlessly active for the faith they had espoused. When Trajan was emperor (98–117 A. D.), Pliny as governor of Bithynia, in Asia Minor, sent a letter of report and inquiry to his imperial master, which is still extant.³ He says of the Christians: “ . . . they are accustomed on certain days to assemble before sunrise, to sing a hymn to Christ as to a god, and to pledge themselves to do no wrong. Afterward they assemble again for a meal in a mixed company, without distinction as to sex or social rank: this they also have discontinued since the imperial edict prohibiting public assemblies. I found it necessary to arrest and examine by torture on the rack two young women they call Diakonissa, but could discover nothing but an unswerving superstition.” It is evident that the governor would not have selected deaconesses for this cruel examination, had they not at times occupied a very prominent place in the Christian circles.

In the days of Chrysostom, about 400 A. D., Constantinople was a magnificent city, in which the wealth of the Orient was combined with Greek elegance and culture, and that the Christian Church of the city had forty deaconesses, shows the strong emphasis placed on practical benevolence. Prominent among these was Olympia, a wealthy widow of the nobility, whom the emperor Theodosius desired to receive into his court, when widowed at the age of eighteen; but she declined the honor and consecrated herself to the deaconess service. She was doubtless the superior in the deaconess community, and the letters addressed to her by Chrysostom from his place of banishment in the Caucasus, testify to the high esteem in which the office was held. The deaconess office had at this time

² It may be mentioned that the beautiful prayer prescribed in the *Constitutions* for the consecration of deaconesses is held in high regard even to this day, and is still used in the office for such services.

³ *Geschichte der weiblichen Diakonie*, Dr. Theodore Schaefer, published at Hamburg, Vol. I., p. 37.

attained the crown of its development. It was in every way an office of the Church. Induction was by the hands of the bishop, under whose oversight the service was governed. Young women came into it not only from the lower classes, but those also from the most wealthy and noble families deemed it an honor to serve.

But this period of the flower of diaconate was also the time of its decay. Chrysostom had warned against the danger of seeking righteousness in good works. The saintly Makrina, of a distinguished family in Pontus (the sister of two bishops, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa, defender of the Nicene Faith), is still a real deaconess in her beautiful service to the poor and sick, bringing comfort, lightening burdens: but the spirit of the nun is growing; emphasis is on the greater merit of celibacy, monastic poverty, ascetic sanctity. Gregory's beautiful biography of his sister may rebuke the selfishness of our age, but it had lost much of the spirit of the gospel. The Convent was the grave of the diaconate. Though here and there in the East deaconesses existed in the Church until the twelfth century, the feudal militarism of the age sent women of strong religious impulse into the convent, just as it drove literature, art and science into the monastery.

It was the dominance of the hierarchy that caused the service of conventional worship to displace the service of loving ministry. With the stifling of the evangelical faith in the Romish Church, the office founded on the gospel of Christian love had to vanish also. Love inspired by Christ does not seek merit for its work, but gives itself freely in the spirit of humble thankfulness for mercies received.

How this spirit of evangelical faith and love was here and there revived is seen in phenomena like the founding of the Beghards and Beguines, by the priest Lambert of Liege, which were religious associations of men and societies of women, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in the Netherlands and Belgium; and the brotherhoods and sisterhoods of the communistic life established by Gerhart Grood in the fourteenth century: the aim of all these was not only mystic contempla-

tion, but also the better instruction of the people and works of practical benevolence. Thomas á Kempis was a member of the brotherhood, and the famous book of which he is author, testifies to their real evangelical spirit. But the Church's relentless persecution to suppress these societies, shows that their spirit and genius were foreign to the Church of that day.

Even after the Reformation this same evangelical spirit emerges in the activity and the societies founded by Vincent de Paul (b. 1576) a Franciscan priest of Paris, the prompting of whose personal zeal and of the societies he formed, *i. e.*, "the Priests of the Mission" and "Sisters of Charity" (not nuns) was evidently real love to Christ.

The Reformation was the revival of the Apostolic Christian faith, a return to the Scriptures as the only fountain of Christian doctrine, and justification by faith in Jesus Christ as the only fountain of Christian life. That this faith should show itself active in love was to be expected. In the large congregations it was impossible for the minister to render every service which opportunity offered. In the century before the Reformation some of the Waldensian and Moravian congregations found it helpful to have deaconesses. But it was necessary that the Gospel should first thoroughly permeate the whole social life of the people, before the diaconate could become successful. Luther had formulated the plan to have a city divided into sections, according to the population, and each to be provided with a pastor and several deaconesses; but it was characteristic of him to say that he did not venture to inaugurate the plan until the Lord had made Christians. Doubtless he was right, as we shall see by the slow progress made during the centuries following.

The Synod of the Lower Rhine province of the Dutch Reformed Church, at Wesel in 1568, resolved to establish two kinds of deacons, one to gather and distribute alms, the other to care for the sick, and that women should engage in this service. At a meeting of the synod ten years later the question again came up, whether the work should not be revived, since

nothing had been done. Many of the convents in the provinces that had become Protestant were devoted to the teaching of children. In the province of Sedan, Netherlands, the Reformed prince Henry Robert von der Mark used the convents for such educational work and for the societies of "Young Women of Charity," who devoted themselves to teaching and the care of the sick.⁴ The Mennonites in Holland had a form of limited deaconess service in some of their congregations. Count Zinzendorf urged the Moravian Synod in 1745 to organize a form of deaconess service in every congregation: and favorable action was taken, but little came of it.

It is remarkable that within the brief space of twenty years four separate attempts were made (1815-1835) to supply the need of the Church by either transplanting the Catholic order of "Sisters of Charity" to Protestant soil, or reviving the deaconess order. The German minister von Stein was profoundly interested in the practical benevolence of the Protestant Church, and favored the organization of sisters of charity, like those in the Romish Church: and the minister von Bodelschwing likewise exerted his influence to encourage such activity on the part of women, pointing especially to those in the upper and middle classes as leading lives of pure indolence.

Amalie Sieveking, like Florence Nightingale, rendered distinguished service to the sick and poor during the Hamburg epidemic in 1831, and endeavored by letter and personal appeal to interest others in founding a Protestant order of "Sisters of Charity": but succeeded only in starting several societies of nurses for the hospitals. She deserves all honor, however, as one of the world's beneficent philanthropists.

⁴We may recall the Pilgrim congregation of the English refugees at Amsterdam, circa 1608, with their pastors Smith and Robinson, and the aged widow of three score years, a deaconess, who clothed her office with much dignity and many years of service. The picture history has retained for us is of her custom to sit at a certain place in the church, and with a birch rod to keep the children orderly during worship. She was also zealous in gathering alms, visiting the sick and needy, and watching over the young women: a real deaconess in all but her "little birchen rod." And there were doubtless many other instances of such devoted helpers, of which no record has been kept.

We came closer to the idea of the Protestant diaconate with Pastor John Klönne, of Wesel, Westphalian Germany, who pointed clearly to the renewal of the New Testament diaconate, instead of aiming to transplant the Catholic society into the Protestant Church; and in 1820 published a brochure, in which he expressed the strong conviction that the revival of the apostolic diaconate was the great problem of the Church of that period. His plan was to make the diaconate of women an office of the congregation, under the supervision of the consistory; the service among the poor and sick should be for two years, and then one half of the number should drop out, to be replaced by others. There was no idea of a life-calling or special training for deaconesses. Klönne gained the approval of several royal and other prominent persons to his plan, and tried to compass the organization by synodal action. He did not live to see his plans realized, but paved the way for others to succeed where he had failed.

Likewise Count Adelbert von Recke-Vollmerstein, the founder of a charitable institution at Dusseldorf,⁵ in 1835 published the first number of a proposed periodical, entitled "The Deaconess, or Life and Service of Female Workers in the Church for Teaching and Nursing." Fliedner had already begun his work at this time in a quiet way. The Count says that for twenty years he had urged the need of deaconesses. His idea was to have the diaconate made a church-office, as in the days of the apostles, and to find the scope for its service not only in the home congregations, but also abroad in the foreign mission fields. A deaconess institute must be established with abbotess, archdeaconess and deaconesses; and this he hoped to accomplish at Düsseldorf. The Crown-prince of Germany, afterward King Frederick IV., became deeply interested in the scheme, and advised that recognition of the deaconess office in the Church be secured by ecclesiastical action. It was a dream, and remained a dream until Fliedner had for years labored and conquered.

⁵ He founded the Rescue House at Düsseldorf, and in later years established the Deaconess Motherhouse in Crashnitz.

I have briefly traced these developments of plans and tentative beginnings, to show that for centuries the need of the female diaconate was keenly and persistently felt in many sections of Protestantism. But the Great Head of the Church does not accomplish His designs by the resolutions of ecclesiastical bodies, nor through the influence of the world's great and noble, but by the humble sacrifice of consecrated Life.⁶ "Not by might, nor by power, saith the Lord."

Geo. Henry Theodore Fliedner came to the little town of Kaiserswerth along the Rhine in January, 1822, having made the journey on foot, to become pastor when only twenty-two years of age. He was born at Epstein, near Wiesbaden, January 21, 1800, where his father was pastor, but died during the strenuous times of war, when the lad was only thirteen years old. Through the generosity of relatives and friends he was sent to the universities of Giessen and Göttingen, and passed his theological examinations at twenty years. Then he was tutor in the home of a merchant at Cologne, until he received the call from Kaiserswerth. He had been settled as pastor in the village for about a month, at an annual salary of 180 thalers, when the factory shut down in which most of his parishioners were silk-weavers: and the town being predominantly Catholic, it seemed impossible to maintain the little congregation. But he felt that if the people needed the Gospel in their prosperity, the need was all the greater in dire poverty. The Good-Shepherd spirit sent him out with the beggar's staff to collect funds along the Rhine, in Holland, and England. He succeeded in his purpose to endow the little parish, and gained what was a thousand fold more to him, an insight into faith-inspired Christian works, which illumined his heart with a consciousness of the work to which God had called him.

The activities of the British and Foreign Bible Society greatly impressed him, and especially the noble influence

⁶When the founder of an English benevolent institution was asked whether it cost a great deal to build up such an institution as he had established, he said, "Yes, it cost a life."

exerted by the British Prison Association. For a man of such aggressive nature nothing could be more impressive than the evidences of living faith he beheld in benevolent institutions and societies for the welfare of men, of missions, the Bible, prisons, the poor, orphans, hospitals, etc. On his return home he began to work zealously for prison-reform, and walked all the way to Düsseldorf, every two weeks for three years, to conduct worship in the penitentiary.⁷ After visiting the chief prisons of the province he organized the Rhenish-Westphalian Prison Association. It was during his tour to collect funds for this association that he discovered the existence of the deaconess office in the Mennonite congregation at Amsterdam, and also secured a copy of Pastor Klönne's brochure on *The Deaconess*. He felt it to be his first duty to provide an asylum for released convicts, to give them Christian care and nurture, and he received the first inmates in 1833 into the garden-house of his parsonage, until larger quarters could be secured. In 1835 he organized an industrial school for girls, and a nursery. With the courage of faith and borrowed money he purchased the largest house in his town, and on October 13, 1836, founded the *first* deaconess motherhouse at Kaiserswerth, whose blessings multiplied wonderfully and have been felt in almost every portion of the earth. Thus the chief aim of his plans and prayers was realized.

I will not stop to describe the striking traits of Fliedner's strong and interesting personality; or to give a catalogue of the schools, asylums, hospitals, homes for the sick, crippled, infirm, of men, women and children, that have sprung up about the motherhouse; or to trace the spread of motherhouses in many lands and cities; or the branches maintained by Kaiserswerth

⁷ Fliedner's spiritual growth is traceable to this period of his life. There was no sudden upheaval, but a gradual inner growth in grace and in the love of Christ. He began to study the Bible as a new book. The evidences of practical Christianity in Holland and England opened his eyes, and the reading of Arndt's *True Christianity* deepened his convictions. Fliedner in one of his journeys became acquainted with Elisabeth Fry, whose efforts for the amelioration of prison conditions in England yielded such splendid results.

at Jerusalem, Alexandria, Cairo, Beirut, Smyrna, etc. I shall add only this personal note, that in 1854 the University of Bonn conferred on Fliedner the honorary degree of doctor of divinity, in recognition of his valuable labors in the field of Christian philanthropy.

Whether the deaconess office is to be regarded a *renewal* of the apostolic diaconate, in its origin and fundamental principles, is an interesting question, to which various answers have been given. Rev. Dr. John H. Wichern,⁸ founder of "Das Rauhe Haus" at Hamburg in 1833, says in Herzog *Cyclopaedia*: "The arrangement and activities of the deaconess institutions do not lead us back to the order of deacons and deaconesses in the Apostolic Church; in them the Protestant Church has rather taken up the thread of the churchly orders and offices for practical benevolence, which were broken off at the time of the Reformation."

Likewise Rev. Dr. Frederick Meyer, rector of the Lutheran Deaconess Home at Neuendettelsau, Bavaria, founded by the sainted Loehe, says: "Since the care of the indigent has in Christian countries been undertaken by the state, Christian charity has found new paths in free organizations; our deaconess homes, though not in organic connection with the Church, are patterned after the Romish order of the 'sisters of charity,' and do not claim to be a restoration of the Apostolic diaconate."

Again Dr. Emil Wacker, rector of the Deaconess Home at Flensburg, Silesia, in a similar strain says, "The institutions of the Romish Church have undoubtedly exercised an important influence on the development of the female diaconate, and it is a mooted question whether in its present form it is to be regarded as a Church-office."

Dr. D. Schley Schaff contributed an article to the *Mercersburg Review* in the April number, 1875, on "Fliedner and the Order of Deaconesses," in which he says, "The Order of

⁸In Herzog *Real-Encyclopedia*, German edition, the article on "Deacons and Deaconess Homes," by Dr. Wichern, quoted in *Der Diakonissenberuf*, by Rev. Carl Goetz, of Koenigsberg.

Deaconesses founded by Fliedner was the *creation* of his own mind. We believe that an organized class of female workers under the name of deaconesses existed in the Apostolic Church, and that they are referred to in Rom. 16: 1, as also in other passages of the New Testament. We know positively that such an organization of female workers did exist in the Eastern Church, continuing until the twelfth and the thirteenth century. At the same time we must again affirm that there is *no designed historical connection* between these and the Order brought into existence by Theodore Fliedner." He refuses to call the order *modern*, or to regard the result of Fliedner's work as "a restitution of the ancient order."⁹

But we think that a restitution or revival is just what it is historically. One of the profoundest scholars among superintendents of deaconess homes is Rev. Dr. Theodore Schaefer, rector and superintendent of the Deaconess Home, at Altona, Prussia, whose three volumes on the *History of the Diaconate* may be regarded as preëminently authoritative. In Volume I. he says: "The greatest of Fliedner's achievements, that which has caused his name to be inscribed in the records of God's Kingdom, is the renewal of the apostolic deaconess office. He has given back to the Church a missing arm of her activity, for which we owe him our greatest thanks. . . . Fliedner's chief merit are his return to the foundations of the Apostolic Church, and his practical insight into the rightful demands of the present."

There is no need that we should go wrong in finding an

* Dr. Schaff continues: "In order then to guard against such an error, we should be particular in the selection of an attribute. 'Deaconesses' was the name given in the absence of any equally expressive and intelligible appellation. Shall we designate the organization the 'Modern' Order of Deaconesses? We think not, for this would demand some closer definition. It seems best to apply the simple terms 'Order of Deaconesses of Kaiserswerth.' We shall thus avoid considering Fliedner's enterprise as a restitution of the ancient order of deaconesses. It must, however, not be understood that Fliedner was ignorant of the existence of an organized body of female laborers at other periods of the history of the Church. He undoubtedly knew about them and was confirmed in his project by this knowledge."

answer to the question, since we can ascertain Fliedner's own ideas and motives, and the pattern he followed in founding the Kaiserswerth institution. Dr. Julius Disselhoff, Fliedner's successor and son-in-law, for thirty-two years the superintendent and a recognized authority of the Kaiserswerth institutions, in 1886 published his *Jubilate*, a semi-centennial Memorial volume of the Kaiserswerth Motherhouse, which bears the significant title, *Jubilee of the Renewal of the Apostolic Deaconess Office (Jubelfeier der Erneuerung des Apostolischen Diakonissenamtes)*. He quotes from Fliedner's own writings about the founding at Kaiserswerth: "Thus humbly and quietly the deaconess mustard-seed was planted, but in faith and in following the footsteps of the Apostolic Church. Hence it has so great promise." And again the words of Fliedner are quoted: "Like the whole Evangelical Church, so the Evangelical deaconess work is an outgrowth of the Scriptural and Apostolic foundation of our Christian faith and life."

There was evidently no idea in his mind to take up the "thread of the Romish orders and offices broken off at the time of the Reformation": but his distinct aim and purpose was to plant on the sacred soil of the early Christian Church. Disselhoff says: "During Fliedner's second visit to Holland in 1827, he made the happy discovery in the Mennonite congregation at Amsterdam that the deaconess office had not wholly died out, but had been revived with the Reformation"; and the detail with which Fliedner in his journal described the work and spirit of self-sacrifice of these deaconesses, shows how deeply he was impressed.

An answer to the question may also be found in the evidence of the New Testament Scriptures. Rom. 16: 1, is the classic and only undisputed passage of the deaconess office, in which St. Paul recommends "Phœbe, our sister" as διάκονος τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Luther translated this "Who is in the service of the church at Cenchrea"; and the old English translation "Who is a servant of the church at Cenchrea," was followed in the Revision with the addition of "a deaconess," in the margin.

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* the title of deaconess is at first ἡ διάκονος, and in the later chapters it is διάκονισσα.

If the office of deaconess had not been familiar to the readers of St. Paul's letter, he would evidently have added an explanation, in order to have his recommendation in the closing chapter to be of value. Bishop Lightfoot speaks thus of the incorrect translation of Rom. 16: 1, and I. Tim. 3: 2, "If the testimony borne in these two passages to the ministry of women in apostolic times had not thus been blotted out of our English Bible, attention would probably have been directed to the subject at an earlier date, and our English Church would not have remained so long maimed in one of her hands."

Looking back to the appointment of the first Seven in the Jerusalem congregation, we recall that persecution prevented them from enlarging their ministry: and it was the same diaconate to which afterward women were chosen. When St. Paul gives direction for the Church-offices (I. Tim. 3: 2) he first speaks of the elders, then that deacons should be grave, not double-tongued, and then he says women in like manner must be grave, temperate, etc. Now if the apostle had intended to refer to the wives of deacons, as this is usually interpreted, it would be strange that he should fail to speak also of the wives of elders, who would be just as important; but St. Paul is here evidently speaking of men-deacons and women-deacons as serving the Church in the same ministry.

It was because of the rapid growth of the early Church that the second office was instituted. Jesus had given the world a new motive; His life was the outpouring of the ointment of love: He had not only been a preacher of the living Word, but had also broken the bread for the hungry by the sea of Galilee. And following His example, the Apostles ministered to the needs of the congregation in the service of the *Word*, and in the service of *tables*: the ministry was two-fold, in things temporal and spiritual. It was natural that they should be most familiar with the Hebrew families in Jerusalem, and that it should be the Hellenists (though this also must have made it all the more annoying to them), who were overlooked

in the distribution; and hence the murmuring arose. The problem that confronted them was, whether to divide the congregation, with the election of more preachers; or to divide the ministry, permitting the elders to devote themselves to the spiritual branch of the work, and electing helpers to attend to the temporal service. They chose the latter course, and added the second office, *diákonos*,¹⁰ helpers, servants; distinguishing clearly between the two spheres, the *Word-ministry* and *table-ministry*. The Apostles did not complain that too much was expected of them. It was their business not only to preach the Love of Christ, but also to practice it, so that men should feel its shepherding and molding influence in their daily life.

It is everywhere acknowledged that the Christian congregation to-day has the right to expect the same close relation of Christ's love in the preaching and the pastoral work. In the small congregation it may be possible for the minister to come into close personal touch with all the members of his flock, but not in the large parish; and here the same murmuring is heard as in the primitive congregation at Jerusalem. I heard a parochial report, which met the popular complaint about pastoral neglect with the apt scriptural quotation, "the Lord delighteth not in the legs of a man." No, but He delighteth in faith working through love. The problem is with us to-day, and it must be solved as the Apostles solved it; by

¹⁰ It is interesting to note how the new motive with which Christ inspired the Apostles was unfolded. We read that with the breath of Pentecost "they continued steadfastly in . . . fellowship." Acts 2: 42. Here the *fellowship*, *kōvovía*, means "having all things common." In Rom. 12: 13 it means "communicating to the necessities of the saints," i. e., fellowship by helpful gifts; but in Rom. 15: 26 fellowship becomes the gift, "it was the good pleasure of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain *contribution* for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem." Here the spirit of fellowship in doing good becomes the *good deed*. The Greek *kōvovía* is closely related to *diakonía*: in fact the *diakonía* became the office of ministering the *kōvovía*; that is, deaconess work is the outgrowth and expression of loving fellowship and service in the Christian Church. The analogy (to which Dr. Schaefer also points in his work) between Acts and Genesis may be permissible: the deacons as *helpers* of the Apostles, reminding us of Genesis 2, "I will make him a help meet for him."

dividing either the congregation or the ministry, and the Protestant Church has for centuries been feeling the need of the helping office, the *diákonos*.

The testimony from Scripture points to the modern diaconate as a *renewal* of the diakonos office of the Apostles, because it is evident that the *needs* are the same. *Secondly*, the service is the same: to visit the sick, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, comfort the imprisoned, destitute, depressed; this is the Christ-appointed work. And *thirdly*, the qualifications are to be the same. Probationers must be "of good report"; fallen women are not admitted. And "full of the Holy Ghost," even "holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." And of "wisdom"; educational and other qualifications are always required, and a course of studies and training is prescribed.

The difference between the ancient and modern deaconess, because in St. Paul's day there were no deaconess homes and training schools, need not be emphasized, when it is remembered that the Apostles also had no colleges or seminaries and foreign mission boards.

Relation to the Church.—In Germany the deaconess mother-house is not under the jurisdiction of the church-bodies or provincial consistories, and does not derive its support from the synod. Dr. Schaefer says, however, that the purpose and general tendency of the homes is to come closer to the Church, and to be incorporated into her government. But even with the independent homes (as with some of our theological schools) when the deaconess is appointed to her service by the consistory of a congregation, the church-relation is complete; she is then a servant in and of the Church. In this country, however, most of the deaconess homes, as in the Lutheran, Methodist and Episcopal churches are maintained and governed as a regular branch of the Church's activity.

The Relation to the Pastor may be briefly adverted to. The deaconess office can be a strong and effective helping hand to the pastoral office, only when it is encouraged, directed and promoted by the latter. This is at once apparent, when the relation of the two is considered. Its aim is to be eyes and

hands to the pastor, to find and bring relief to those in need, and to draw the unchurchly under the influence of the ministry of the Word.

Pastor Goetz points to the frequent occasions prompted by the pericopes, to have the pulpit speak definitely of the deaconess work. If the sermon-theme be chosen on the second Sunday of Epiphany from Rom. 12; on Septuagesima Sunday from the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, or on leaving father and mother and receiving back an hundred fold; on Rogate Sunday, of religion pure and undefiled; on the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, on the parable of the good Samaritan; or on the motto of many of the deaconess homes, "I was sick and ye visited me"; it would be unnatural for one, acquainted with this noble work, not to refer to its beautiful service in some appealing way; not only as illustrative of a Christ-like ministry, but to win some unoccupied life for consecration to the Church's service. The first chapter of many lives of noble deaconess service points to such testimony from the voice of the pulpit.

And in the catechetical instruction the pastor will also be prompted to awaken the desire in the hearts of the young men and women to give their talents to the service of the divine Master, in the ministry of the Word and of the diaconate. And when a young life is filled with the spirit of such consecration, to guide it wisely, remembering on the one hand the duty we owe to father and mother, and on the other the constraining motive of pure Love to Christ. The pastoral duty may also involve the father's privilege of seeking to guide a daughter as well as a son into the ministry of the Church. In Silesia it was found that only two deaconesses had come from 868 ministerial families; while in a district of Hanover out of 84 deaconesses, ten had come from ministers' homes, or twelve per cent. of the whole number. The large home at Neuendettelsau, Bavaria, with its various branches, in 1902 had over 500 deaconesses, of whom 61 had come from the homes of pastors.

The Deaconess Office as a Life-calling.—The probationer

having finished the course of instruction and training, at her ordination assumes the diaconate vows as a calling for life, the spirit of which does not differ from the obligations assumed by the minister of the Gospel. No iron chains bind him to his work, and should the Lord open the way into another path, he will not hesitate to freely follow His guidance. So with the deaconess, the constraint is not from without, but from within. It may be worth mention that the Kaiserswerth Home formerly had the custom, at their ordination to obligate the entrants to the deaconess office for a period of five years. It was thought that such a vow would help them over the hard places during the most trying years of service: but the only reminder of this rule that now remains is a beautiful little celebration of the fifth anniversary of the deaconess's consecration.

Love and thanksgiving are emphasized with the deaconess as the ruling motive; while with the Catholic "sister of charity" the appeal is to the sanctity of her calling and the claim to a reward which is supposed not to be attainable in another sphere. Catholic theology uses the words "more holy here and more blessed there," to the corona adding the coronella.

The Deaconess Home.—Fliedner following the plan of the apostolic diaconate, found it necessary to add the institutional motherhouse for training, coöperation and fellowship, and this has been largely the secret of the success and power of the modern diaconate of women. If he profited by the example of the convent in the Roman Catholic Church, it was to avoid their mistake in making the formal religion of conventional life an object in itself; whereby it ceases to be a helping hand to the ministry of the Word. Kaiserswerth has always emphasized service, viz., in three-fold form: (1) As servants of Christ in and for His Church, (2) as ministers unto the poor and needy, and (3) as helpers to each other.

The advantages of the home or motherhouse are readily apparent. Here aptness and ability are developed. Not only knowledge and skill are acquired, but a firm Christian char-

acter is unfolded. Strong personalities can stand alone, but in coöperation and fellowship even ordinary talents can be used for the exercise of power and blessing. Then also it is the aim of the home to surround both probationers and deaconesses with a spiritual atmosphere, in which they become strong for service in the Church. And the home remains the center from which the deaconesses are sent out on their errands and labors, and to which they finally return for rest when life's evening has come.

The Spheres of Work open to the deaconess include (1) *Teaching*. In the early Church teaching was not the least important work of the diaconate, as can be seen from a number of Scriptural examples, and at present a large field is also open. In some American deaconess training schools the educational and cultural course is over-emphasized, almost to the exclusion of the practical branches. (2) *As Nurse*. Every real deaconess must have practical training as a nurse, the opportunities of the trained and skillful helper in so many severe crises making her service invaluable. By reason of her character and motives the deaconess is the ideal nurse both in the hospital and in the Christian home. (3) *As Parish Deaconess*. This was the chief sphere of the apostolic diaconate, and also during the centuries following, as seen for instance at Constantinople in the time of Chrysostom. In this service, as pastor's helper, her best talents, her highest training and culture will find a large field for activity, and everywhere the harvest is great, but the laborers so few. (4) *As Missionary Deaconess*. Phoebe, a parish worker, under the direction of St. Paul, became a missionary deaconess. With the social customs prevalent in the ancient world as in modern Orient, many homes would be open to the tactful influence of woman, which are permanently closed to men. The Leipsic Missionary Society secures deaconesses for the work in India, since their spirit and special training fit them to do Zenana work, and also to organize the native female workers in the foreign mission fields.

On the relation of the deaconess home to the *hospital* it may

be well to add the earnest word of warning uttered by Rev. Dr. Christian Golder in his recently published *Deaconess Motherhouse*, since it has force also for conditions in our Reformed Church. Speaking of developments in the Methodist Church, he says: "The chief mistake, which even to-day is not always avoided, was made in giving to deaconess institutions too largely the character of hospitals. There is a growing demand for large hospitals; physicians urge development along this line, and the demand for room often becomes so pressing that it seems impossible to resist. A large hospital is then built. But, as a result, the supply of deaconesses is insufficient, and a training school for nurses is organized. Sometimes in this the vain hope is entertained that of the young women preparing to become trained nurses some may decide to become deaconesses. Experience has taught the reverse. The number of deaconesses instead of growing is decreased, and deaconesses who are not possessed of a firm purpose, are in constant temptation of becoming professional nurses. . . . I know of more than a dozen institutions, several of them not of Methodist connection, which have *suffered shipwreck on this rock* within the last decade. Many institutions to-day have a miserable existence simply because of this duplex condition . . . The deaconess institute must be the center of things, and all its branch institutions—the hospital, kindergarten, maternity hospital, infirmary, etc.—are affiliated with it only for the purpose of giving the sisters an adequate training for their calling. The deaconess home should be separate from the hospital, and should form the center of a group of institutional buildings. And where the whole institution must of necessity be under one roof, extreme caution should be exercised that the hospital does not absorb the deaconess home. It is not possible to warn the Church too much against these numerous and extensive hospital enterprises in connection with the deaconess cause. They have done *more harm to the incipient deaconess work* in the United States than all other factors combined."

The present status of the deaconess work may be presented

most briefly with the aid of statistics. The Kaiserswerth Union holds triennial conferences, and in 1864 reported 30 motherhouses, and 1,600 deaconesses, active in 368 fields of labor. In 1906 the number had grown to more than 80 motherhouses, with 16,500 deaconesses. The homes are distributed thus: Germany, 50; Austria, 1; Russia, 7; Scandinavia, 3; the Netherlands, 9; France, 2; Switzerland, 4; United States, 3 (viz., three of the Lutheran Church, Philadelphia (Drexel), Baltimore and Omaha, being enrolled). But the Kaiserswerth Union includes only about two thirds of the European motherhouses, some being held aloof by differences of creed.

The deaconess work was introduced *into America* by Dr. Theodore Fliedner himself. In 1845 Dr. Passavant, pastor of the Lutheran Church at Pittsburg, gave to Kaiserswerth a sum of money to educate several deaconesses for this country; and in 1849 Dr. Fliedner visited America, bringing with him four deaconesses. The work was thus started with every promise of success, the Lutheran Synod having given their hearty endorsement of the cause. But the suspicion that Roman Catholic methods were being introduced into the Church, because of the deaconess garb, aroused violent opposition, and all but the hospital feature of the new institution had to be abandoned. Twenty years later the work was revived. The beautiful and imposing Mary J. Drexel Deaconess Institute in Philadelphia is doubtless the largest in this country, founded by that philanthropic Christian merchant John D. Lankenau, who gave his millions to this institution, which is under the care of the General Council of the Lutheran Church. The Lutheran churches in America have 9 deaconess homes (English, German, Norwegian and Swedish) with 238 deaconesses, active in 52 stations.

The Evangelical Protestant Association includes deaconess homes of the Evangelical Synod of North America, and inter-denominational institutions, in which some of our German Reformed congregations are deeply interested, giving their

contributions and their young women to the service.¹¹ This association includes 12 homes, with about 200 deaconesses.

In the Protestant Episcopal Church the deaconess work was started by Dr. William Muhlenberg, but was not generally recognized by the Church until it had been favorably reported by a deaconess committee of the board of home missions. The deaconess board now includes bishops, clergy and laymen. The Episcopal Church has sisterhoods and deaconess homes. The sisterhoods are under the guidance of bishops, and the members have the privilege of living with their parents. The deaconesses are also under the supervision of bishops, but are associated with the deaconess homes. Their training is, however, chiefly intellectual, with little or no emphasis on the practical side of real deaconess work.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has some of the largest and most successful deaconess institutions in this country. The work was started by Mrs. Anna Wittemeyer, an angel of mercy to the wounded soldiers in 1861-1865, who was assisted by Mrs. Susan Fry. Bishop Simpson was deeply interested in the diaconate cause, and Bishop Thoburn also gave it very strong personal impulse for the sake of his zenana work in India. Dr. Christian Golder, of Cincinnati, was one of the first in his Church to point the way to the organization of deaconess homes after the pattern of the Kaiserswerth institutions, which he had carefully studied abroad.¹² The names of Mrs. Lucy Rider Meyer, of Chicago, with her City Missions Training School, and Mrs. Jane Bancroft Bobinson, credited with founding forty deaconess homes and stations, are asso-

¹¹ Our Reformed deaconess homes in the West were connected with this association, until they were turned into hospitals.

¹² From personal acquaintance I can speak of Dr. Golder as a foremost authority in this country on the female diaconate, having been its chief spokesman and advocate in his own Church for more than a generation. His volume, *History of the Deaconess Movement in the Christian Church* (published 1903, by the Methodist Publishing House, Jennings and Pye, Cincinnati), with its 200 illustrations, is perhaps the most illuminating work on the subject published in this country. And his recently issued *The Deaconess Motherhouse* gives valuable hints on adapting the Kaiserswerth plan to our American conditions.

ciated with the growth of this work in the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1906 this denomination had 69 deaconess institutions, and 835 deaconesses and probationers: with invested interests exceeding three millions of dollars.

The complete statistics for America are not at present available, but from the most reliable data at hand it may be safely stated that there are more than 80 deaconess institutions (the figures of some churches, however, include also fields of labor), with about 1,400 deaconesses. This does not include the figures of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The total of the army of deaconesses in Christendom is therefore more than 25,000.

In our *Reformed Church* the progress of deaconess work has been exceedingly slow, not to say discouraging, although the cause has received cordial approval of General Synod, and recognition in our new church-constitution. I quoted at some length Dr. Golder's warning, with regard to the danger of over-emphasizing the hospital branch of the deaconess education, because the same experience has been repeated in our Church with heavy losses to the cause. The Deaconess Hospital at Alliance, Ohio, was started with every prospect of success, but had to be abandoned several years ago, and is now simply a hospital with paid nurses; the young women were willing to go into the hospital to become trained nurses, with the attractive money compensation held out in that sphere of professional activity, but were not willing to become deaconesses in the service of the Church. The Bethesda Deaconess Hospital at Cleveland, for years highly favored and full of promise, foundered on the same rock, and was changed into the German Hospital of the city.

A school and bible course "for the Training of Visiting Deaconesses" has been established at Cleveland with the venerable Dr. H. J. Ruetenik as superintendent. The aim is to train missionary or teaching deaconesses, rather than parish or hospital deaconesses, and the course seems to be for pupils in the school, or by correspondence. There are six young ladies taking the course. Dr. Ruetenik says: "We are now

endeavoring to establish a training school for deaconesses on the plan of Bible study. The hope is that young ladies of decided Christian experience after such study may have the spirit of self-denying love, enabling them to serve faithfully."

The only deaconess institution in our Reformed Church, conducted along the lines of the Kaiserswerth plan, is therefore the Phœbe Deaconess and Old Folks Home at Allentown, Pa., whose fifth anniversary was observed October 7, 1909. It was founded and is conducted under the care of the three adjacent classes in the Eastern Synod, viz., Lehigh, East Pennsylvania and Tohickon. Its inception dates back to a paper on the deaconess movement read by the venerable Dr. A. B. Koplin at a meeting of the Lehigh Valley Ministerial Association in the fall of 1900. It has three ordained deaconesses and several probationers, and in the Old Folks Home has cared for ten aged women, of whom six are now remaining under its loving protection. Associated with the board of the Phœbe Home is a large and efficient Ladies' auxiliary; and a new and commodious building is to be erected for the extension of its work in the near future. The superintendent, Miss Johanna Baur, was sent to undertake this work by the board of the German Methodist Episcopal Bethesda Deaconess Home of Cincinnati, through the brotherly courtesy of Rev. Dr. Golder, and for five years has loyally helped the Phœbe Home to attain its measure of success. An interesting "Red booklet," giving valuable information for those interested is issued by the Phœbe Home and will be cheerfully sent for the asking by application to the home at Allentown.

BETHLEHEM, PA.

V.

THE ENCOURAGEMENTS WHICH RELIGIOUS
THOUGHT IN JAPAN PRESENTS TO THE
ACCEPTANCE OF THE GOSPEL.

HENRY K. MILLER.

To a missionary the very fact that there *is* what our subject calls "religious thought" in Japan ought to be a great encouragement. Frequently it is asserted that the Japanese are particularly deficient in the religious sense, but that is an error. Probably this wrong estimate arises from two facts: first, that in Japan the relation between religion and morality has been different from that in Christian communities; and, second, that the two terms "religion" and "morality" have not been understood by the Japanese exactly as by Christians. With us morality has become thoroughly permeated with the religious spirit. The two are indissolubly wedded, and whenever they are violently divorced, the result sooner or later is a decay of good conduct. On the contrary, speaking broadly, in Japan what is called religion is something apart from what is called morality. Shinto, the native religion, is conspicuously lacking in moral teaching. Buddhism, it is true, furnishes many ethical precepts, some of which are of a high order, but the Japanese do not regulate their daily lives according to its doctrine. It is the practical teaching of Confucius, the greatest of Chinese sages, that controls the conduct of the Japanese, and this doctrine, though not lacking religious references, is yet primarily and prevailingly ethical. Thus to western eyes the specifically religious element so called in the lives of the Japanese seems relatively unimportant, and many, therefore, without further inquiry pronounce the people as a whole deficient in religious sentiment. But account must also be taken

64 *Encouragements which Religious Thought in Japan*

of the second fact already mentioned, namely, that the terms "religion" and "morality" do not mean exactly the same to the Japanese as to us westerners. Careful attention to the use of the word "religion" in ordinary conversation will disclose the fact that it generally means what we should call rites and ceremonies (which are primarily intended for the unlearned), *together with the theological and philosophical disquisitions* affected by the educated. In other words, what in Japan has been called religion, we in the West designate by such names as "ritual," "cult," etc. The purpose of such "religion" is ordinarily to secure a variety of blessings for the devotee, as material prosperity, protection against natural calamities and evil spirits, and elevation of mind above all finite limitations. Thus religion as understood in Japan does not, generally speaking, furnish the motives for good conduct. That which we consider the very life of religion—the many-sided spiritual force manifesting itself in the characters and virtuous acts of men and women—is relegated in Japan to what is known as morality. Yet a careful examination of people's ethical ideas and their motives of conduct will disclose genuine religious content, although of an undeveloped order. In general the social organization consists of a carefully graded series of lower and higher individuals and groups. A responsible unit owes duties to those above, and the sense of obligation has its roots in reverence for one's superiors. In fact everything pertaining to a superior is treated in the same manner as things pertaining to a God. For example, meeting such an one in person is called "worshipping his face," his possessions are "worshipfully borrowed," and so on. These and similar expressions are now merely marks of politeness, but one may well imagine that originally Japanese courtesy proceeded on the principle of according to another person the same respect as that paid to a god. Again, Christians have often been puzzled as to whether certain practices in Japan are to be regarded as idolatrous or as national customs having no religious meaning. When on the national memorial day the people pay their respects to the soldiers slain in battle, they are said to "go to a temple and

worship" (*sampai suru*), but there are intelligent and earnest missionaries who feel that they can, without violating their consciences, make the customary obeisance before the shrine dedicated to the shades of these brave dead. The fact seems to be that we have in the spiritual life of the Japanese what might be compared to a chemical solution, in which the component elements are thoroughly mixed. To the Japanese mind in its normal state there is no such clear distinction between the religious and the secular. Homage is paid to anyone and anything that is strange, extraordinary or superior, and no question is asked as to whether a different sort of reverence is to be paid to a god than to a great hero, or to the glorious sun, or to an ideal. All alike inspire him with awe. No doubt Christian teaching will act as a precipitant upon this mixture. Then clear distinctions will be made between the worship of God, respect for departed heroes, admiration for the glories of the natural creation, and regard for one's fellows.

Here then, the Christian missionary finds in Japanese religious thought much to encourage him. It matters not by what name it goes, the religious spirit is really present in the life of the people here, undifferentiated, but genuine. What is needed to clarify religion in Japan from its non-religious admixtures is the leaven of Christian theism. Let once the idea of the only true God as revealed in Jesus Christ become regnant in the thinking of the Japanese, then not only will polytheism and idolatry go, but both God and man, acquiring separate and individual importance, become ennobled, a new and better reverence for the divine and a more rational respect for man will arise, and morality will have the ultimate fact of God our Heavenly Father both for its immovable basis and its unifying principle. Let us missionaries, then, penetrating beyond the morality of the people of Japan to their great mainspring of action—the sentiment of awe for whatever in any sense is high or extraordinary—and recognizing this as essentially and deeply religious, devote our best efforts toward developing it and freeing it from all that does not properly belong to it. Just as alchemy was developed into chemistry and astrology

66 *Encouragements which Religious Thought in Japan*

into astronomy, so ought we not to destroy this great principle of action in the vain hope of substituting another for it, but rather complete it, not indeed by making external additions to it, but by infusing into it the new leaven of Christian truth.

In the next place, the pantheism underlying religious thought in Japan, though generally and justly considered inimical to Christian faith, may from one point of view be regarded as a kind of preparation for the Gospel. Whenever there is a lapse from Christian theism to a pantheistic religion, then, of course, we must regard the latter with disfavor. However, if we arrange the different stages of religious development in the order of their importance, we must assign pantheism a relatively high place. Yea, more; not only recognizing indications of divinity everywhere in the universe, but actually deifying the universe itself, pantheism undermines polytheism and asserts the unity of God. Is that not a tremendous advance in the direction of Christianity? True, as everyone knows, pantheistic presuppositions do not foster the growth of the idea of personality, but that is just the point, again, at which it is the missionaries' duty to put in the leaven of Christian truth. Now is it not a great gain, if, instead of having to begin lower down with teaching "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," we may begin high up with belief in the only one who is all in all, however imperfectly His nature is apprehended?

A third encouraging thing about religious thought in Japan is that it has reached the legal stage of development. To be sure, there are people here as elsewhere who are at heart lawless, who act generally upon impulse and regulate their conduct according to no fixed principle other than "their own sweet will." As a rule, the Japanese people have grown beyond that. They have a wholesome respect for law. In fact, seen with our eyes, they enjoy an excess of government. Personal initiative, at least in the past, has not been encouraged generally, but rather implicit obedience to the laws. Moreover, a complicated and minute system of rules, prescriptions, directions, etc., regulates their lives, even to unimportant details. Whenever

a new project of some importance is to be undertaken, a suitable number of regulations is first drawn up to govern the method of procedure. Frequently people do not know how to act, because there is no rule governing the case in question. Moreover, in the absence of precedent, there is great hesitation to act at all, for fear of troublesome complications, and so on. The point I wish to make is that this fixed habit of conforming to rules, regulations and laws has a very good side to it. To be sure, no one who has been brought up on St. Paul's ideas upon this stage of moral and religious development, can be blind to the evils that attach themselves to legalism. Whenever *any* sort of development is arrested it is apt to reproduce the very evils it once outgrew. Still, conceding all this, surely in this scientific age, when the universality and supremacy of law is generally recognized by intelligent people, we Christians must insist upon law-abiding religion as essential to salvation. Formal obedience to external laws, which so easily runs into hypocrisy and all manner of sanctified wickedness, is indeed a terrible evil, but alas! too often the effort to escape this Charybdis by weakening or setting aside the authority of law lands people into the opposite Scylla of shameless debauchery. A superficial student of Christianity might suppose that its cardinal doctrine of salvation by faith sets aside the law, but a true understanding of the case makes it clear that it is only the mechanical, slavish, forced subjection to external laws ending in themselves, that is condemned. Aside from this, Christians are expected to be the most law-abiding people of all, not stopping at the observance of only what is formally prescribed or enacted, but striving to do whatever is right and reasonable, even though not formulated into a "Thou shalt." The Christian is satisfied with nothing less than voluntary, intelligent obedience to the highest of all laws, namely, the perfect will of God. His obedience is that of a dutiful son, who understands and appreciates his father's loving purposes, and loyally, cheerfully falls in with them, making them his own.

Now what should be our attitude as missionaries toward this

68 *Encouragements which Religious Thought in Japan*

legalistic development of moral and religious life in Japan? Surely we ought not to condemn it for some of the abuses attaching to it. Rather let us look upon it as evidence of great spiritual progress. The legalist may not have attained to the stature of a full grown man, but, compared with the moral infant whose actions are fitful and uncontrolled, he is a splendid youth. What we should do is to Christianize this legalism, showing that in general all laws are more or less accurate expressions of the Supreme Will acting rationally and in love, and that obedience in order to be perfect must be from the heart and free from sectional, racial or other like prejudices—in a word, like the obedience of Christ.

Fourth, missionaries may find much to encourage them in the development Buddhism has taken in the Shin Sect. As is well known, orthodox Buddhism is a way of salvation by works. This idea the Japanese express by the word *jiriki* ("one's own strength"). The founder of the Shin Sect, however, asserted the opposite principle of salvation through the strength of another, that is, *tariki*. Amida Buddha in mercy and by virtue of his exhaustless merit saves all who simply call on his name, apart from the ordinary works of merit required of other secretaries. Some suppose that Shinran Shonin, founder of the Shin Sect, learned something of Nestorian Christianity in China, which knowledge he worked over into a new Buddhistic system. Whether such was actually the case, may not be certain; but anyhow reason demands that both principles—self-reliance and dependence (*jiriki* and *tariki*)—should be recognized in religion. It is so in Christianity. While salvation comes alone through faith in Christ and cannot be earned by performing works of merit, yet in another sense we must "work out our salvation in fear and trembling."

We have here a pretty close approximation to Christianity after a fashion. What shall be our attitude toward it? Does *Amida-kyō* offer us a point of departure from which we might lead its adherents to Christian faith? At the conclusion of Dr. Carl Fries's lecture in Yamagata city an inquiry meeting was held, when one of those present, a prosecuting attorney of

considerable influence, in a perfectly respectful and apparently sincere manner inquired in what particulars Christianity was superior to *Amida-kyō*, avowing himself ready to accept Christianity if its superiority could be demonstrated. I believe that this man was not an isolated case, but a type, and that many could be easily approached by us missionaries if we thoroughly understood the weak and the strong points of their religious beliefs. Especially would a study of *Amida-kyō* be an advantage to us. It would enable us to point out the difference between an historical personage like Jesus Christ and a mere personification of light like Amida, who owes his existence to the fertility of men's imagination; it would enable us intelligently to compare the two kinds of faith represented; it would bring out clearly the two diverse kinds of salvation offered; and finally it would reveal the fundamentally different presuppositions underlying the seeming resemblances in the two systems. This comparison would show which teaching is superior, and, that point made clear, faith in Christ might reasonably be expected to follow in due time.

There remains one point more to be discussed, viz., *Bushidō*, the "Way of the Warrior." While not professedly a religion, this code of honor served all the purposes of a religion to the ancient *samurai* (military caste). Says Brinkley: "If religion be the source from which spring the motives of men's noblest actions, then the religion of Japan was neither the Law of the Buddha (*Buppō*) nor the Path of the Gods (*Shintō*) but the Way of the Warrior (*Bushidō*)."¹ Now it is easy to lavish excessive praise on this cult, as has sometimes been done by persons whose allegiance to Christianity has waned. But the merits or demerits of the system as a whole are not now under discussion. The particular point here of special interest to the Christian missionary is the unreserved allegiance of the vassal to his lord which this code developed. This is putting the matter concretely; to state it abstractly, the *samurai* devoted himself completely to his ideal, viz., duty. Here we have a trait that is essential to the making, not only of a true *samurai*, but also of a perfect man. There is not much to

expect of a person without a cause that can enlist his whole soul. It was a true instinct that led men in all ages to lay great emphasis upon the principle of loyalty. In Japan it is the virtue of virtues.

Now, do we not here have a good stepping-stone to that higher and broader allegiance supplied through the Gospel? If we could show the *samurai* that Christ is his King and that God is Lord of all, his loyal nature ought to make him a splendid Christian, ready to do and dare for the right as newly revealed to him, even unto death. Moreover, this new loyalty would correct the defects of the old, since his new duty would be more comprehensive. He would no longer be lax in his family relations, his pride would be transfigured into self-respect and chastened by love for his enemies, and his word would be as good as his bond to friend and foe alike without distinction.

In all that has been asserted above it is, of course, to be understood that but one side of the case has been presented. Religious thought is like a two-edged sword that cuts in opposite directions. The very things that have been set forth as encouragements have an aspect that might well tend to discouragement. Much depends upon the missionary himself. He will find what he looks for. God grant that in dealing with the religious thought confronting us in this country we may prove ourselves "workmen that need not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth" (II. Tim. 2, 15).

YAMAGATA, JAPAN.

VI.

THE VALUE OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IN TRAINING FOR CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

CALVIN M. DE LONG.

Some one has said that the greatest discovery of the nineteenth century was the discovery of childhood. This is true especially in the sense that it was a rediscovery. There have been times in the history of the Church when the child occupied a central position. But then, buried under complex dogmatic systems, ritualism, and ecclesiasticism, he was lost sight of for hundreds of years. During the last century, however, the Church again turned her attention to the child. Ever since, her interest in the training of the children has been growing; so that this is preëminently an age interested in youth. The time devoted in our day to child study, religious pedagogy, and psychology evidences this truth. The principal subject discussed at recent educational gatherings, church councils, and spiritual conferences was the moral and religious instruction of the young. Practically all Christian denominations are laying stress as never before upon the Sunday-school, the institution that stands for moral and religious training. We are beginning to feel that here lies the strategic point of the Church and of religion. There is then no more timely subject for us to consider than the value of the Sunday-school in training for church membership.

The history of the Church in all ages clearly shows that the greatest factor in her growth and development has been the school idea. The Hebrew people gave to the world the most perfect religion of antiquity. The evolution of Judaism we must attribute to many causes. But there is none that did more to impress the principles of the Jewish religion upon the

hearts of its followers than the systematic instruction of the children. To this the Jews carefully attended. With them education was intensely religious. With every synagogue, of which there was a great number, a school was connected. In it young and old were instructed in the Scriptures. Here lies the secret of the strength of the Jewish religion. In Hebrew church history there are no "Middle Ages" because the training of the children for church membership was never neglected. Even to-day their schools are models of excellence. The Talmud says: "If you would destroy the Jews you must destroy their schools."

Jesus Christ gave the child his proper place in the Church. We read that He took a little child and placed him in the midst of the disciples. He claimed that here lay the hope of the Church. He "went about teaching" and His final injunction was "Go teach." The disciples carried out faithfully this command of the Master. Most of the early Christian churches had schools connected with them where the children and new converts were prepared for full membership. Before the close of the first century many catechetical schools were in existence. More than one writer has attributed the rapid spread of Christianity over the then civilized world in less than four centuries to the influence of Christian teaching. That the schools of the Christians were considered a great power in their religion is shown by the fact that Julian, the Apostate, desiring to weaken Christianity, issued an edict suppressing Christian teachers.

A period came when the Church grew worldly and formal. The pure faith and godly piety of the early Christians was lost in the ritualism and ecclesiasticism of the Church of the Middle Ages. The office of teaching was neglected and the child was forgotten. Does it not seem as though the poverty of the Church's spiritual life from the sixth to the fifteenth century was due to the lack of exercising her educational function?

One of the results of the Reformation was the restoration of the school idea in the Church. A flood of catechisms was

poured out upon the protestant world. Ministers everywhere were required to instruct the children in the Word of God. This had such an effect on the growth of Protestantism that the Roman Church saw its great value and in order to save herself adopted the practice. From this time on the Catholics gave more attention to the training of their children than any other body of Christians.

Ere long Protestantism forgot the lesson of the Reformation. The scholastic spirit manifested itself. Protestants in their eager desire to refute the heresies and teachings of the Roman Church neglected the child in the Kingdom of God. Dogmatic theology and metaphysics dominated the thinking of the clergy for more than a century after the Reformation. Any one conversant with the history of the latter part of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century knows to what low ebb religion and morality had fallen. Many reasons have been assigned for this. But I believe, with a number of historians, that this condition of the Church and of religion was due to the fact that the Church had forgotten to exercise her teaching function.

With the introduction of the modern Sunday-school the tide changes. The movement started by Robert Raikes saved Christianity. Wherever Sunday-schools were planted in England, Germany and America, there religion was revived and a new life manifested itself in the Church. I think we can feel safe in saying that the strongest factor in the development of the Church in our land has been the Sunday-school and that to-day this is the greatest force in our religious life.

The Sunday-school is the very basis of the Christian Church. Through it the young are trained for church membership. In trying to account for renewed religious zeal and increased activity at different times there are those who make much of revivals and evangelistic campaigns. It is true that these have done much good to the Church. But of far greater value has been the work of the Sunday-school. It not only tries to lead the child to Christ, but it aims especially at keeping him close to the Master. The Sunday-school works on the principle

that religion is a life and a growth. It seeks the development of Christian character. It stands for educational religion. There is no denomination to which it should mean more than to the members of the Reformed Church.

The Sunday-school has been rightly called the "power-house" of the Church and "the most productive enterprise and finest asset in the possession of the Church." The majority of the congregations organized within the past fifty years had their beginning in a Sunday-school. A writer in a recent religious publication says: "Ninety-five per cent. of our preachers, eighty-five per cent. of our converts, ninety-five per cent. of our church workers come out of the Sunday-school." Must we not admit that our most faithful elders and deacons; our most earnest Sunday-school officers and teachers and our best church members were reared in the Sunday-school? It is a powerful agency to revive a congregation and bring to it greater activity. It is a fountain from which flow streams of life-giving influences. Our congregations to-day could not live without their schools. "As soon as we have no schools," said a Roman Catholic bishop, "we shall have no churches." When the Protestants were driven out of Austria several centuries ago the Catholics said, "We will persecute them." But a wise diplomat said, "Do not persecute them; close their schools." They did so, and in forty-five years there were no more Protestants in Austria. Seventy-five years ago Sunday-schools were planted in two country congregations of our Church in eastern Pennsylvania. Ever since strong and flourishing schools in which both parents and children are drinking in the wisdom of the Master have been maintained. As monuments to this Sunday-school work we have to-day two of the most substantial congregations in our denomination. If we were to remove from the Church the influence of the Sabbath-school for the last fifty or seventy-five years what would be the state of religion!

The Sunday-school has rendered and to-day is rendering an excellent service to the Church. And yet this work is far from what it should and could be. We are making a weak

effort to profit by the history of the school idea. We call the Sunday-school the "power-house" of the Church, but we do not appropriate this power. In a certain sense we are criminally neglecting the young. We do not avail ourselves of the great opportunities to train our boys and girls for church membership. We are not saying that the Church is not succeeding. It has always succeeded; but it is not succeeding in a sufficient degree.

There are three institutions in our American life that can be made to minister to the child's moral and spiritual development—the family, the public school and the Sabbath-school. In the average home very little or no effort is made to instruct the child in religious truth. This is not due so much perhaps to the indifference of parents as to the force of circumstances. Our conditions of life are so complex and strenuous that in many a family there is no home life. This militates powerfully against keeping the fires of the family altar burning.

Our public schools give no direct training in religion and morals. They are of course not heathenish, as some have called them. While they lift up before the boys and girls the ideal life, Jesus Christ, they do not give any formal religious and moral instruction. Nor is this the business of the state schools. It is the Church's duty to look after the spiritual welfare of her children.

Practically the only institution of our day that stands for moral and religious training of the young is the Sabbath-school. While the Church owes to this magnificent organization an unpayable debt of gratitude it falls far short of what it might be. The quality of its work is not nearly as good as that of the day school. It has only to a limited degree employed the principles and methods of education. At the most one hour per week is devoted to religious instruction. Often schools are poorly organized. In many cases the teaching is very inefficient and unsatisfactory. And what is still worse, thirteen millions of children and youth in our country never cross the threshold of a Bible school, either Protestant or Roman Catholic. When we consider these facts we are sur-

prised that the Church is what it is. On the other hand, if we look at its infinite possibilities we see a glorious vision of what the Church might be through the ministry of the Sunday-school.

What then is needed to make the Sunday-school effective in training for church membership? The answer to this question depends in the first place upon the aim of the Sunday-school. There are Sabbath-schools whose aim is statistical. Great numbers and large figures are to them an indication of growth. Others have the evangelistic aim. If they succeed in bringing every scholar on some "Decision Day" to commit himself to Jesus Christ they have reached their goal. Finally there are those with the educational aim. They seek the development of the spiritual life. Their object is to cultivate character through religious instruction. The efficiency of a Sunday-school does not depend so much on numbers, nor on how many scholars have been led to Christ, but on what the children have become. Are they Christ-like? Do they grow in Christian virtue? While every efficient Sunday-school has the Church in view, its primary object is to develop Christian character. Making men Christ-like is the very best preparation for church membership. The aim of the Sabbath-school is not different from that of public worship, preaching or the prayer-meeting. It is simply one of the agencies, yea the very best agency of the Church, to accomplish her great aim, the conversion of men and their cultivation in Christian character. The Sunday-school is not only the children's church, but the adult's church at well. It is not so much a branch of congregational work as it is the congregation itself. In it both young and old should meet for the studying of the Bible. There never comes a time when a scholar is fully prepared for church membership. There must be a continual preparation all through life. A man never comes to an age for graduation from the Bible school. The rabbis said: "The righteous go from the synagogue to the school, from the place of prayer to the place of study." On the other hand, the Sunday-school that trains for church membership strives to have all its

scholars attend preaching services. This result is most easily obtained when the school holds its session immediately before public worship.

The Sunday-school also becomes a strong factor in training for church membership when we emphasize the fact that it is the nursery of the Church. The old school-teacher, who always lifted his cap to his scholars as to the future masters of the world, was right. The boys and girls of to-day will be the Church of tomorrow. The question with which we are generally concerned is, "What of our Church to-day?" But a more important question is "What of the Church of tomorrow?" A farmer who is indifferent to his spring wheat cannot expect any harvest. And how can we hope for a strong church in the days that are to come if we neglect the children to-day? This is one of the fundamental truths that should be impressed continually upon the minds of the adult members of the Church. No person has a right to be a member of the consistory who is in the least indifferent to the Sunday-school or who is not thoroughly imbued with the Sunday-school idea. A congregation should care and provide for its school as a father is concerned about the welfare of his son.

If our schools are to be instrumental in training for church membership we must recognize the psychological truth that character is most easily influenced and shaped in early life. The child's mind is very plastic and susceptible. You can bend the little twig but the mighty oak resists the strongest storms. The stories and teachings of Jesus impress the child far more deeply than the man. Character is a bundle of habits. Most of our habits are formed in childhood and youth. Then the foundation of life is laid. In our boyhood days we form, as it were, a plan according to which life in later years will be unfolded. Childhood and youth are prophets of manhood and old age. Christians must therefore be made before their character has been fully formed or else they will be lost to the Church. Childhood and youth also develop thieves, murderers and other transgressors of the law. There is no truth of greater significance to the Church. This the Catholics

have fully realized. St. Francis Xavier said: "Give me the children until they are seven years old and any one may take them." No people are more faithful to their Church than the Catholics. Their houses of worship are filled on the Sabbath. Whatever else may be said of the Catholic Church it nevertheless remains true that her church requirements are strictly observed. The Roman Church receives from her people the exact things that she asks for. How do we account for this? There is only one explanation and that is that the child is thoroughly trained. How do we explain the sinful indifference of Protestants to church going and church duties? The answer is the same. We criminally neglect the child. You say this is an old truth. But this is a principle that should be emphasized in every treatise on the Sunday-school. Never was a more important truth uttered. It is high time for the Protestant Church to wake up and discharge her duty. At this very point lies the hope of Protestantism. Cardinal Manning said: "Give me the children and England shall be Catholic in twenty years." But it is equally true that if we give the children to Christ the world will be Christian in twenty years. "Train up a child in the way he should go, and even when he is old he will not depart from it."

Fichte has said: "Whatever you would put into a nation's life you must put into its schools." So we may say that whatever you would put into the Church's life you must put into the Sunday-school. If we expect our members to be interested in missions we must teach missions in the Sunday-school. The reason why many people are indifferent to this work is because they are not informed and have never been converted to it. The Sunday-school offers the greatest opportunity for the promotion of missionary knowledge and zeal. If we cannot pay our home and foreign mission debts through the strong appeals that are being made all over the Church then let us begin to implant the missionary principle into the hearts of our children. This is the Church's best policy to keep out of debt. The custom of observing home and foreign mission day in the Sunday-school is a splendid practice. When the offerings re-

ceived at such times are made known our superintendents are often discouraged and there are those who ask, "Does it pay?" But the few dollars raised at these services cannot be compared in value to the missionary knowledge imparted and the missionary zeal and interest created. Every \$5,000 given by the boys and girls to-day will mean a hundred thousand dollars when they will be men and women.

Many churches are to-day financially embarrassed because their members have never learned to give. Here again the Sunday-school has a great opportunity to train the children in benevolence. The ability to give, however, you cannot develop by teaching the boys and girls to sing, "Hear the pennies dropping." For a child to give a penny merely because a parent has given it to him, not knowing for what cause he gives, is almost as bad as not to give at all. The Sunday-school has for its object the training of pupils in Christian character. And all the giving in Sunday-school should have as a part of its aim the development of the spirit of genuine benevolence. The money given by children should never be used to equip the school, buy lesson helps, and meet other home expenses. It is the congregation's business to support the school as it is a father's duty to care for his little son. All demands for contributions from the various institutions of the Church should be used as means to develop in our boys and girls the grace of Christian giving.

We can also make the Sunday-school a great temperance-teaching organization. The fact that this subject is being studied by millions of young minds in our Sunday-schools is a matter of tremendous significance. The liquor dealers of our country have more to fear from the Sunday-school than from the temperance lecturer and agitator. Planting temperance principles into the child's heart is more effective than prayer and personal appeals. In the temperance movement that is sweeping over the land at this time the Sunday-school children have played no small part. If the Sunday-school takes advantage of the great opportunities offered to undermine this evil there will not be a saloon in the United States in twenty years.

We have often heard it said that Americans lack the virtue of reverence. This sin manifests itself even in the house of God. Is not the poverty of public worship in some chur ~s due in a large measure to the deteriorating influence of , .y Sunday-school services? The element of devotion is often forgotten. The object of the Sunday-school is the moral and religious education of its members. But education can never be purely intellectual. The religious feelings need cultivation as much as the mind requires religious instruction. The teaching of the Bible makes its chief appeal to the intellect and true worship to the feelings. The ideal Sunday-school aims at worship as truly as at the teaching of the lesson. The Sunday-school should be permeated with an atmosphere that tends to develop reverence, adoration, love, penitence, aspiration and hope. The superintendent who pounds on the desk to secure order, librarians who parade through the aisles distributing books while the school is in session, leaders who convert the service into a drill in singing—all these are detrimental to the fostering of the true spirit of devotion and worship. Wherever possible it is desirable that the different departments of the school should have separate exercises. A service adapted to the adult members is not very helpful to the youngest pupils. But at all events the Sunday-school service should aim at the cultivation of true reverence.

A great many members of the Christian Church live in the valley of dry bones. Many congregations are dead. In them we find little active practical Christianity. They have forgotten that Jesus came to minister and that to be a Christian means to serve. To resurrect such congregations and breathe into them a new life the Sunday-school of to-day affords a splendid opportunity. The modern Sunday-school with its home department, cradle roll, organized classes and social service constitutes an organization for practical Christian service such as the Church has never before had. The Sunday-school has been defined as the Church at work. But it is equally true that through the Sunday-school we can put the Church to work.

The program outlined to thoroughly prepare for church membership cannot perhaps be carried out by devoting simply the usual Sunday-school hour to religious training. We need week-day Bible instruction. While the spirit of religion should be infused into the public schools and the whole educational organism we have no right to demand that the state prepare our boys and girls for the Church. Formal religious instruction is not only impracticable in the public schools, but this is clearly the Church's duty. Inasmuch as popular education is an outgrowth of the Church, she has a right, however, to some of the time of the week-day school. The day is coming when our churches will give week-day religious instruction to the children as is done in France, Germany and some parts of our own country.

We need to magnify the Sunday-school idea and put more life and energy into this organization. In my humble opinion most congregations have too many societies and auxiliaries. Church machinery we must have. But if an engine is too large and heavy in proportion to the power at command no work can be done. Most congregations are over-organized. They do not possess enough energy to run successfully their different societies and consequently the Sunday-school suffers. Let the Church drop some of her brotherhoods, guilds and leagues and infuse this energy into the Sabbath-school. Then we shall have a school that will be able to train for church membership. There are few congregations in our Church that possess more life than is needed to make the Sunday-school a strong and powerful agency of the Church.

Nothing can contribute more to the value of the Sunday-school in training for church membership than the pastor. Expert and trained leadership is demanded. A few years ago the divinity schools paid little attention to the preparation of ministers for Sunday-school work. The graduates of our theological seminaries were about as well fitted to direct a Sunday-school as to superintend a great financial institution. But we rejoice that the Sunday-school idea has been put into the seminary. Forty-two theological schools in our country either have

chairs of religious pedagogy or are giving at least some time each year to the training of their students for Sunday-school work. The curricula include less dogmatics and Hebrew and more practical theology. This is one of the hopeful signs of the times in the Church and augurs well for a new era in God's kingdom on earth.

There are those who tell us that the Church is losing ground. This I do not believe. But if it were so it would mean that the Church is neglecting to exercise her educational function. Right here lies the hope of the Church in the new century. Most of the religious problems that confront us to-day can be solved through the Sunday-school. Whether we shall have a church weak or powerful depends upon what we make of the opportunities offered by this organization. This is a truth of truths. As ministers we can afford to neglect almost anything sooner than this life-giving agency of the Church. It behooves us then to lift it as nearly to an ideal condition as possible. The Talmud says: "Jerusalem was destroyed because the instruction of the young was neglected." A holier temple than that which fell before the onslaughts of the Roman army is ours to guard. Its safety depends upon the proper training of the boys and girls. Let us therefore give to the child the place assigned it by Jesus when he set it in the midst of the disciples and the Church and said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

EAST GREENVILLE, PA.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

A. S. WEBER.

A NEW CONTEST ON AN OLD BATTLE FIELD.

During the past year by far the most significant and spirited theological discussion in England had to do with the age-old problems centering in the personality of Jesus. The discussion was occasioned by an article on "*Jesus Or Christ?*" in the January issue of the *Hibbert Journal*. The article was written by a Congregational minister, the Rev. R. Roberts, who is evidently a well-informed and sympathetic student of those German scholars who are disposed to introduce into theologic thought a distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of religion. In the judgment of those scholars, the authentic historic facts concerning Jesus to be gathered from the synoptic Gospels do not lend a sufficient support to the ideas commonly associated with Christ. Mr. Roberts accepts this judgment and raises the issue with great zest and little self-restraint as to whether the claims of current orthodoxy are "made on behalf of a spiritual '*ideal*' to which we may provisionally apply the word '*Christ*,' or predicated of Jesus. According to his view Christian "apologists do not frankly face" the problems that are thus suggested.

From this attitude assumed by the author, he proceeds to show the inconsistency of a number of distinguished scholars in their use of "Jesus" and "Christ" in passages quoted from their writings, and argues against the legitimacy of such interchangeable use of the terms in defining his personality. The line of thought pursued by the article in attempting to justify

its contentions may be indicated, with sufficient accuracy perhaps for the present purpose, in a brief summary: The trustworthy historical data in the New Testament concerning Jesus are "extremely meager, fragmentary and unsatisfactory." "Close and careful reading of extant documents reduces our knowledge of him to a small, and, it must be added, to a narrowing compass." By taking the history as it stands, he thinks, it exhibits a person naïvely human rather than divine. He knows nothing of Greek thought, nothing of political economy. He cannot be imagined to have had an understanding of conceptions such as have since been enunciated by Newton and Copernicus. He was steeped in the Eastern and Jewish ideas of the age in which he lived. He believed and taught an approaching world-catastrophe which did not take place, and in his teaching about divorce he accepted the Oriental degradation of women. The narrow limitations of his thought, exhibited in these and other incidents recorded in the gospel narratives, he regards as irreconcilable with the conception of his person stated in the Creeds. And the way out of the difficulties thus suggested, by taking refuge in the doctrine of the Kenosis, or the Divine self-emptying, is declared to be no way out at all. "The concept is both absurd and impossible."

The immediate outcome of such a bold arraignment of long-cherished doctrinal views might very easily have been anticipated. An extremely negative position as this is, and trespassing as it does the bounds of sober exegesis, would not be passed by in silence, or without protest. Those acquainted with the history of doctrine and the victories achieved in early Christological disputes, would not consider this new challenge *unanswerable*. To point out apparent defects and limitations in the historic figure of the Gospels, and to base thereon a disparagement of his value as a spiritual asset in the world-scheme, they would say, was comparatively easy, but to disprove by them the mighty cluster of positive scriptural and historic facts was an attempt at once arrogant and vain. Christ's position in the faith of the Church to-day lies not in

what He was not or did not; it rests rather on what He was and did, on what He is known to have impressed Himself as being upon those who were intimately associated with Him. How can we account for the unique impression that Jesus made on His disciples? How came they to speak of Him as they did? How did He succeed in commanding their confidence and devotion, their love and worship? How did Paul come to entertain his exalted views about Jesus, to rejoice in being permitted to call himself the bond-slave of the Master, and to spend his life in carrying the gospel message to the nations? How did the Church arise, and how has it been held together through the centuries often in the very face of hostile criticism and cruel persecution? These and similar questions, it might have been known in advance, would be asked by those challenged with the inquiry "Jesus or Christ?"

And what it might have been possible to forecast has actually happened. "Within a week of the publication of Mr. Roberts' article," the editor of the *Journal* in which it appeared wrote a few months ago, "replies and criticisms, eulogies and condemnations, began to pour in from all quarters, and even now after seven months the stream continues to flow." The contentions and conclusions of the article have become the topic for preachers' sermons and public lectures, for lengthy columns of discussion in the religious and daily newspaper press, and for most serious and carefully thought-out contributions published in reviews and books. The volume of all this literature is simply amazing, and it goes to show that the question dealt with is one that is vividly present to the minds of many, that it lies close to the heart of religious thought, and that new light upon it is as earnestly sought as it is cordially welcomed.

It does not fall within the scope of these notes on current thought to notice contributions to the discussion of such a problem that are merely controversial and ephemeral, but the reviews and books just referred to are permanently important, and may with propriety, therefore, claim attention in this place.

Among these important books, the one that is entitled to our

86 *Contemporary Religious and Theological Thought.*

first consideration is made up of eighteen essays by as many different writers on various aspects of the question. The book is issued as a supplement to the *Hibbert Journal* for the year 1909.¹ The contributors were chosen from a wide circle of competent scholarship and approved devotion to the causes severally represented by them. Romanism, Anglicanism and Protestantism have their representatives. So have Trinitarianism, Unitarianism and Pragmatism. Theologians, philosophers and physicists are among the writers. A bishop, college presidents, theological professors, preachers and laymen have been allowed their word, some from England and Scotland, Germany and Switzerland, and one from America. The result of their combined labor has been characterized by an adverse critic of the variety of their views as "a cinematograph of chaos," but the editor's observation that "it is better to face the varied opinions of the competent, than to remain among the worst confusions of unguided thought," will probably command very general assent and approbation. This, at any rate, will be gratefully acknowledged by many of the readers of the volume—it provides a readily accessible treasury of reference on one of the supremely important doctrines of our faith, and whilst no one will be able to concur in all that is written, its value for information and guidance cannot be written down by the sneer of flippant and captious critics.

Within our limited space it is impossible of course to make even briefest reference to the particular views of Jesus' personality advanced by all the writers. Were it possible, such a task would be neither necessary nor desirable. The end to be accomplished will be reached by noticing a few of the points emphasized by several of the leading contributors. The late Father Tyrrell discussing *The Point at Issue*, observes that familiarized as we have lately become with a distinction between the historical Christ—the Jesus of the Gospels—and the eternal Christ—Jesus immanent in the Christian community and revealing himself progressively to the faith, we usually

¹ *Jesus Or Christ?*—*The Hibbert Journal Supplement*, 1909. Cloth, 282 pages. Price \$1.50 net. Sherman, French and Company, Boston, Mass.

speak of Jesus in the first case, and of Christ in the second. "They are not the names of two beings, unless for those who mean by Christ an ideal suggested by, symbolized and honored in, its partial realization, in the historical Jesus. They are the names of one person, 'Jesus' being denotative, 'Christ' connotative and explanatory." He maintains the validity of the orthodox position that "Christ" means "the second person of the Trinity made man," and asserts that "the predicate 'Christ' as affirmed by the Creeds, agrees with the subject 'Jesus' as determined by criticism." And in reference to the Divine-human mystery in Christ's being, he is satisfied to think that "personality as over against the individuality of a man so completely evades our observation, not to say our conception, that the substitution of a divine for a human personality can no more be historically disproved than the absence of the substance of bread in the consecrated host. All the accidents and effects are the same; all the vulgar mind means by substance remains." An intellect that can subscribe to such a philosophic theory can of course have little difficulty in accounting to its own satisfaction for the traditional view of Christ's person.

The Rev. Canon Scott Holland, in his paper on "The Jesus of History and the Christ of Religion" makes the vital inquiry "Why did those who wrote the Gospels not feel the collision which afflicts us? Why did it never occur to them to say Jesus or Christ?" Were men to face these questions clearly, that is, were they to ask why the first Christians gave Jesus the place in their religion which they unquestionably did give him, they would be on the way to get guidance for their thought and support for their faith. Such, for substance, seems to be the conclusion also of Professor Bacon, of Yale University, the subject of whose essay is worded like Canon Holland's. With much that is claimed by advanced critics he is in full accord, holding that so far as light and leading are concerned, the three-syllabled message—"Our Father"—of the historic Jesus, embodies the whole Gospel. But, he adds, "it is absurd to talk of the Christian religion simply as affording us light

and leading, and to the neglect of another factor which historically has made it what it is. That factor is the deliverance, the power, the life that we need." The knowledge of this second factor lies beyond the sphere to which the tests of historical criticism can be applied. It is in evidence in the spiritual experiences of the first disciples and of Paul, it accounts for their belief in him as the Christ of God, and "it is precisely in this field of persistently recurrent psychological experience, *and only here*, that an absolute test of the trustworthiness of the Gospel lies within the reach of every man." Therefore, the ultimate decision as regards the question "Jesus or Christ?" cannot be determined by historical research or critical investigation; it must rest in assent or dissent of the individual human soul, on the basis of its own experience.

From the view-point of a Pragmatist, the brilliant contribution of Professor Percy Gardner headed "Jesus Or Christ?" lends additional confirmation to the conclusions reached by the two last-mentioned writers. From his lectures on "The Historical View of the New Testament" published eight or ten years ago, his rather extreme critical position is well known, and from that position there is nothing to show in the present paper that he has departed. At the same time, however, he confidently asserts his conviction that "he who came to the earth as Jesus has dwelt there to our days as Christ." He quotes with approval Dr. Robert W. Dale's notable utterance that "we are justified in arguing from the sacred facts of the Christian consciousness to historic views as to the life of Jesus on earth." In connection with several remarkable paragraphs in which the facts of early Christianity, most surprising and unparalleled in character, are recounted, he gives utterance to these memorable words: "It is a fatal aberration to make the human life of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels in any way unreal. We must be content to see in them the memorial of a human life, without sin and governed by a unity of will with the divine purposes which makes it quite unique. Yet we in no way transgress the canons of reason and of history if we connect that life with the outpouring of a fresh tide of spiritual

life upon the world, which took form in the perpetuation of the spirit and the obedience of Jesus in the inspiration of the Christian Church." These are weighty words, and their bearing on the question at issue needs no explanation.

Without staying to examine the equally important conclusions reached in the papers of Principal Garvie, Bishop Talbot and Sir Oliver Lodge, or to point out the unsatisfying contentions of Dr. Weinel, Professor Schmiedel and Pastor R. J. Campbell, in their essays, we pass now to the notice of the second volume that owes its appearance directly to the challenge of the now famous *Hibbert* article. Small, unpretentious and inexpensive, this second book² will be found to have a value wholly out of proportion to its size and cost. Those acquainted with the previous writings of its author, the Rev. Dr. J. Warschauer, will recall how great a wealth of learning, gathered from various fields of literature, enriches his pages, how luminous and vigorous are his language and style, and how frank and fair is the spirit that pervades his arguments and discussions. All this, at its best, together with added passion and power, is present in this piece of strong controversial writing. All his native endowments and versatile attainments seem to have been laid under tribute in the production of this little volume. The high purpose he aims to fulfil accounts for this. Although himself a liberal religious thinker, he is aroused by the hostile attitude of a new school of thought which, in disregard of much that is sacred to Christians, has turned liberalism into rank skepticism and unbelief. This new school (represented in England by the author of the article that has provoked the present discussion), as he sees it, "not only doubts the supremacy and even the historicity of our Lord, but attempts to dethrone him from his unique position as the center and Object of Christian faith." The form of these attempts varies. Now it seeks to reduce Jesus to a shadowy figure of vague tradition, now it disputes His originality, now it points to alleged flaws in His teaching, and now airily dis-

² *Jesus Or Christ?* by the Rev. J. Warschauer, M.A., D.Phil. Cloth, 128 pages. Price 75 cents net. James Clarke & Co., London.

misses him altogether—but whatever the form, its ultimate purpose is the same, and calls for strenuous resistance.

That which fires the mind of this London minister-theologian, and moves him to summon the best he can command to his service for making the required resistance, results from his apprehension of its necessity in the interests of practical religion—not from an idle desire to maintain an academic theological position over against an opposing view. This practical aim makes itself felt in every one of the five successive chapters which make up the contents of the volume, and particularly in the concluding one. Beyond these general observations on the character of the book, it is necessary for us to limit our references to three particular points forcibly brought out in it. (1) The picture of the historical Jesus presented in our first three Gospels warrants the language of devotion, of affection, of deepest reverence, which Christians have at all times used concerning their Lord. If it must be granted that our historical material is meager, still it remains true that “into these short and incomplete (Synoptic) sketches there is crowded more of sublime thought, exalted feeling, world-transforming action, than may be found in whole libraries of decorous biography. Additional material might have been welcome, but could not have modified in any essential the picture we already possess.” He accepts the impression which that picture originally made and which has maintained itself through the centuries, and is still held and emphasized by New Testament scholars who by no stretch of language can be described as traditionalists or reactionaries. His conclusion is that “the truth rests with that cloud of witnesses who with one accord declare that they have seen ‘the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ’ rather than with those that assure us that they have not.”

So in opposition to those that deny the uniqueness of ‘Jesus’ personality, he declares (2) that the *kind* of uniqueness that is predicated of Jesus must be remembered—a uniqueness “in virtue of which we see in him the perfect revelation of God on a finite scale, *i. e.*, within the limits of manhood.” In

explanation of the phrases "on a finite scale," and "within the limits of manhood" he observes that "of course we believe with the whole of Christiandom that it was God's own Self that was manifested in our Lord. But that is not to maintain, and Christendom never has maintained, that there was, during certain years of the world's history, no other God than Jesus Christ, that he who declared and prayed to the Father *was* the Father. To hold that is sheer confusion of thought. God's infinitude, which 'heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain' could not become finite and localized. Nevertheless, what Jesus showed forth was Light of Light, very God of very God, so that 'henceforth we know him, and have seen him.'" From Him, and from Him alone, mankind has learned to believe in God as its Father, and here is the ultimate reason why the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith are not two but one. "Others have spoken of God by that name—he hath *showed* us the Father, and it sufficeth us."

The vindication of this uniqueness of Jesus rests not simply on what we know from the Gospels of His teachings and acts whilst on earth; the immediate and persistent historic effects accomplished and maintained by Him establish the uniqueness of the Cause. Professor Harnack, in felicitous phrase, affirms that "every great and potent personality reveals part of his own essential quality only in those affected by him. Nay, the more dynamic a personality and the greater his influence upon the inner life of others, the less is the sum-total of his being to be measured solely by his own words and deeds. One has to take into account the reflex effect produced by him upon those who have accepted him as their guide and master." Dr. Warschauer shares these views with the distinguished German theologian, and concludes (3) "that a life which, like that of Jesus, has produced unique results, inspired a unique literature, stamped its impress upon unnumbered souls, and shaped the history of well-nigh two thousand years, must itself have had a unique quality" entitling the Prophet of Nazareth to man's faith in Him as Jesus the Christ.

In turning from our examination of the first two of the

volumes before us, to the consideration of the third, we pass into a wholly different intellectual atmosphere. Principal Forsyth's book,³ quite as full of literary brightness, artistic verve, and religious passion, as either of the others, betrays too often a bitterness of temper, an impatience with current modes of thought, that sometimes pains a reader, and deprives its pages constantly of the geniality and winsomeness characteristic of the others. In a contest like the present, nothing is to be gained by dipping the controversial pen in gall. And yet one can understand why Dr. Forsyth should allow himself to do so. So thoroughly convinced and unalterably established are his opinions on the questions at issue, that he will hold no terms whatever with the modern trend of religious ideas and doctrines—a trend which as described by him, "becomes sympathetic with a Christ it does not worship, and praises a Christ to whom it does not pray." A movement like this, he thinks, not only disowns apostolic Christology, but dishonors Christ by lowering Him to the position of "the most inspired of the prophets of God's love, the most radical of social reformers, and the noblest of elder brothers." To his mind no compromise is possible between views of the Gospel based on low conceptions of Christ like these, and the view of it on which is built a Church of saved men. "We cannot dissociate the Gospel from the broad apostolic interpretation of our Lord's person. According to that interpretation Jesus Christ was absolute in religion. As far back as we can go we find only the belief and worship of a risen, redeeming, and glorified Christ."

That which gives added seriousness and gravity to the situation in the present conflict on an old field, grows out of its perilous similarity to Gnosticism in the earlier ages of the Church's history. "Now as then the debate is not between the Church and the world, but within the Church itself. The issue is between men of religion and men of faith; between those who beatify Christ and those who deify him; between

³ *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, the Rev. Principal P. T. Forsyth, D.D. Cloth, 250 pages. Price \$2.00. Hodder and Stoughton, London.

those who honor him with a certain discrimination and reserve, and those who trust their whole soul and world to him for ever and ever." From the Gnostic controversies the apostolic interpretation of Christ as an integral part of Christianity issued in triumph, and so, our author is confident, it will also in the present instance. "The New Testament is not the first stage of the evolution, but the last stage of the revolutionary fact. Its writers, under a power that was more than that of genius or poetic insight, were able to divine once for all the Saviourship and the Godhead of their Master. Till Jesus was understood and interpreted, in the light of his resurrection and glorification, the perfect revelation he brought had no voice to move the soul. The fact without the word is dumb; the word without the fact is empty." With a rushing flood of epigram, of which he is such a consummate master, with rare spiritual fervor, and an impressive testimony of and appeal to personal experience, Dr. Forsyth argues for the soundness and reasonableness of this faith. "I owe him my total self. He has not only healed me, in passing, of an old trouble, but has given me eternal life. In my inmost experience, tested by years of life, he has brought me to God. We never turn to God in faith but we are straightway met by Christ. And if he is a phantasm only, then nothing real or credible remains."

One other point emphasized in this volume deserves attention: The so-called Kenotic principle, ruthlessly brushed aside by more than one of the writers in the first of the books above referred to, is frankly and unreservedly accepted as a most trustworthy guide to one's proper apprehension of the truth in the transcendently important field of Jesus' personality. He holds with instructed courage, and maintains with a mental out-reach which taxes one's best efforts to follow, that, assuming the validity of the doctrine of Christ's preëxistence as a postulate of saving faith, "we face in Christ a Godhead self-reduced, but real, whose infinite power took effect in self-humiliation, the absolute living in him in a finite center. By his own will God in Christ reduced his intelligence from being actual to being potential, within the kingdom of power or

94 *Contemporary Religions and Theological Thought.*

nature; while from that potentiality, as Christ grew in grace, it regained actual omniscience by living it back, by the moral way of the kingdom of grace, till he left the world behind, to be determined as the Son of God with power." Whatever may be said as to the ideas involved in such language, it is instructive to notice, that by means of them some minds can win for themselves a real, if partial, command of the ultimate bases of Christology. Whether this is at the same time possible also for differently constituted minds, is another question. In the judgment of the present writer, this is by far the strongest and the most important piece of work that has come to us from the strikingly vigorous argumentative pen of Dr. Forsyth. Even when one has subtracted from its contents those contentions which fail to carry one's approbation, those features which betray impatience with, if not bitterness against, views opposed to his, and those speculative rationalizations which are too deep and obscure for ordinary mortal to fathom and understand, the book still renders a real and valuable service of which those interested in the high theme it discusses will gladly and gratefully avail themselves. It should have been possibly said before that the book is not like the others the immediate result of the article that called out the others. It is rather the rich fruit of long-continued meditation and reflection, but its publication is so timed as to meet, and if possible to counteract the effects of the modern radical criticism of the Gospels.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

VIII.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

A. V. HIESTER.

More's *Utopia* enjoys the distinction of being the first social philosophy of any importance to be published in the English language. The English mind is practical rather than speculative. In no department of human endeavor is this distinctive quality so much in evidence as in the political. Not only has the English nation been less given to the making of ideal political systems, but it has also been less influenced by them, than other European peoples. And it should not be a matter of surprise, therefore, that the *Utopia* was longer in winning its way to public recognition at home than was the case on the Continent, where its original Latin form and its various translations, from the first, rendered it just as accessible to Continental as to English scholars. For a time, indeed, it attracted little attention anywhere, but all through the seventeenth century, after its worth had begun to be generally recognized, it found many imitators on the Continent. Its romantic form recommended it to minds with a bent for speculation, as well as to an age in which romance was the only safe way, if there was any safe way, of indulging in criticisms of the established order of things. Frequently, indeed, such criticisms were safe only when thickly veiled, for almost everywhere feudalism, with its general political decentralization and its system of municipal autonomy, had given way to political absolutism. In imitation, then, of More's work, and because of the rise of political centralization and absolutism, the making of political romances became for a time a favorite species of literary effort, particularly on the Continent and among the Latin nations. An additional reason why the political schemes of

the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were so frequently clothed in romance instead of sober fact, is because the methods and materials necessary to a scientific study of social phenomena had not yet become available. Scientific methods, and above all the scientific spirit, were the peculiar gift of the nineteenth century.

While the utopias of the seventeenth century are all more or less influenced by More's work, they are inspired by various purposes and proceed from various points of view, and what is still more to the purpose, they find their panaceas in widely different schemes and devices. Probably the best known of these seventeenth century utopias is the *Civitas Solis* of Tommaso Campanella, which was written in romance fashion in the course of a twenty-seven years' imprisonment, and published in 1623, more than a century after its great prototype. Campanella was a Dominican friar of southern Italy, who, like More, though in less degree, was a zealous disciple of the New Learning. His philosophy was a mixture of materialism and pantheism. But with all his materialism and rationalism his devotion to the creed and practice of the Catholic Church was never shaken. His entire system, indeed, appears to be a mixture of unmixable things. Its distinctive qualities are to be found, first, in this impossible union of materialism with a narrow Christian theology; secondly, in a peculiar blending of Platonism with medieval monasticism; and, thirdly, in the conception of papal autocracy as the ideal of political organization.

The *Civitas Solis* is a dialogue between a Knight Templar and a sea-captain, who tells of a wonderful city which he has visited on one of his voyages, and whose laws and institutions he proceeds to describe in detail. In its setting, therefore, it is an exact copy of the *Utopia*. Many of its main features, too, it borrows from More's work, while in a number of important particulars in which the *Utopia* differs from the *Republic* it follows the latter rather than the former. This it does, for example, when it extends the communistic principle to wives and children. It does this again in its provisions for

a universal military training and the control of the population by the state, in its aristocratic recognition of social classes, and in its requirement that no one can be elected to the chief magistracy until he has submitted himself to a searching examination in all the sciences. It differs, on the other hand, from both the *Republic* and the *Utopia* in its repudiation of slavery. It differs again from the *Utopia* in the constitution of its government and the character of its religious establishment. While the *Utopia* is a popular republic based on theism, the *Civitas Solis* is a theocratic republic and its religion a form of pantheism. And just because of its pantheistic confounding of man, nature and God, the individual is more completely ignored, and his thinking and conduct more strictly regulated, than is the case in the *Utopia*; although it must be remembered that a large measure of suppression of the individual in the interest of the common good is all-essential to any scheme of communism.

The constitution of its government is probably the most original feature of Campanella's scheme, for it is the logical outgrowth of the ultimate philosophical principle on which he explained nature and history, the principle that all the phenomena of both can be summed up under the three principles of power, wisdom and love. The head of this theocratic republic is endowed with supreme wisdom and authority in both spiritual and secular matters. His title is "Hoh," and he is elected for life by a college of magistrates after he has demonstrated his fitness to rule by means of examinations in all the sciences. The latter is a Platonic idea; while in the manner of "Hoh's" election, as well as in the tenure and power of his office, it is easy to recognize the Roman Pontiff of medieval Christianity. Associated with "Hoh" in the government are three chief ministers of equal power, who like their superior combine religious and secular functions, and who are known as "Potentia," "Prudentia" and "Amor." These are not examined in all the sciences as "Hoh" is; they are required to know only those with which they will have to do in their respective spheres of administration. "Potentia" has the

care of all matters relating to war and diplomacy. "Prudentia" is concerned with the administration of the public works, the liberal and mechanical arts, and everything relating to the sciences and the various schools devoted to their promotion. "Amor" has to do with all matters relating to the perpetuation, preservation and improvement of the population: with the education of the children; with agriculture, commerce, cooking and whatever has to do with food and clothing; with the regulation of the relations between the sexes, and particularly with the mating of men and women so as to produce the best offspring. The minor magistrates are chosen by "Hoh" and his three ministers in conjunction with the teachers of the particular arts and sciences with which their offices have to do. With the double advantage of the general wisdom of "Hoh" and the more particular knowledge of his ministers and teachers, the presumption is that the state will always secure the fittest persons to fill its offices. Besides the magistrates, who are also priests and possess all authority in legislation and administration, there is a popular assembly whose power is limited to the determination of questions relating to peace and war.

Like Plato, Campanella recognizes in his state the principle of social classes. Both make three classes, although their classifications do not correspond exactly. For instead of giving to his middle class the ancient function of military defense, as Plato does, Campanella gives it the modern function of industry. He follows Plato again, and this time without modification, in basing his classes, not on wealth or birth, but on the principle of election, the assignment of the members of the state to their respective classes being vested by him in the priest-magistrates, who correspond to Plato's philosopher-guardians, and whose constant and minute supervision of the whole life of the citizen is presumed, here again as in the choice of administrative officials, to insure the best results through the assignment of every citizen to the class to which he properly belongs. But quite apart from the particular principle upon which his classification is based, Campanella

differs fundamentally from modern systems of communism in permitting social classes at all.

All things are in common in the City of the Sun, the arts, honors, pleasures, labor and the means of subsistence, as well as property, wives and children. Like Plato, Campanella recognizes that family life is clearly incompatible with the principle of communal property, since private property is acquired and improved for no other reason than that each one has his own wife and children. Family life is declared to be the root of self-love and incompatible, therefore, with the highest form of love for the state; for according to Campanella's philosophy everything must be absolutely subordinated to the welfare of the state. An important consequence of the elimination of the family is that all the members of the state, except those under discipline for vice and crime, eat at common tables. Children are permitted to remain with their mothers to the age of two years, at which time the state assumes their care and education, and the relation of parent and child ceases.

Notwithstanding the fact that the recognition of the principle of social classes is a violation of the law of equality, an almost perfect equality holds between the sexes. Men and women wear the same kind of clothes, the only difference being in the length of the tunic. There are also slight differences in industry necessitated by differences of physical strength and endurance. As a general principle, however, the sexes are instructed together in the same arts. So far is this carried, as in the *Republic*, that the women are trained for war just as the men are.

In his industrial arrangements Campanella improves on More by reducing the work day from six hours, as it is in the *Utopia*, to four. Inasmuch as all are required to render service of some sort to the state, unless totally incapacitated, this number is regarded as sufficient to secure to each one, under equitable distribution of the products of industry, all the necessities of life. The rest of the time is given to pleasant mental and bodily exercises. In order, however, to

promote the physical improvement of the population no games are allowed which are played sitting. In the emphasis which it lays on education, physical, mental and moral, and in its complete subordination of the individual to the state, the *Civitas Solis* presents a picture of Spartan severity.

This subordination of the individual to the state is typical of the general tone and spirit of the work. It is cold and abstract, and utterly lacking in that warm living touch with real life which is so characteristic of the *Utopia*. While the *Utopia* presents a more or less faithful picture of modern political life, the *Civitas Solis* is thoroughly unreal, chimerical and medieval. It ignores the rights of the heart and the dignity of the affections. It is metaphysics, not life. It regards man, not as a living, thinking, feeling and willing being, but as an automaton, a machine, a thing made to order. This fundamental distinction in tone and spirit between the *Utopia* and the *Civitas Solis* is very largely owing to the fact that the one was written by a practical Englishman, a broad scholar, an experienced man of affairs, and the other by an Italian monk who saw the world through prison bars.

The English utopias of the seventeenth century were for the most part political in character. The only important exception is the *Nova Atlantis* of Francis Bacon, which was written between 1614 and 1617, and published in 1629, three years after its author's death. It was originally written in Latin, and while it borrows freely from Plato and the Bible, it clearly reflects the spirit of its own age, which was above all else an age of discovery and exploration. It foreshadows the discovery of the Australian continent, in whose seas its ideal commonwealth is located, just as the old Atlantis, a mythical island in the North Atlantic referred to by Plato and other ancient writers, foreshadowed the discovery of the American continent. The unique character of the *Nova Atlantis* is to be found in the fact that it makes experimental science the great civilizer through which man is bound to his fellows, led to the knowledge and love of God, and given dominion over all things; and in the further fact that the advancement of learn-

ing and the organization of knowledge are accomplished solely through political agencies. The work was to have been completed by the addition of a second part treating of the political, economic and social aspects of a model commonwealth; but this was never written.

That the English utopias of the seventeenth century were of a predominantly political character is due to the overthrow of Charles I and the establishment of the Commonwealth, which set men to thinking about first principles in matters of government and law as never before. The particular problem which all the English speculative writings of a political character of this period attacked was the problem of the origin and justification of government; and just because they were so intimately concerned with the problems of their own time, they exhibit little of the influence of Plato and More. Of this class of utopias two are particularly noteworthy, viz., the *Leviathan, or the Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*, 1651, by Thomas Hobbes, and James Harrington's *Commonwealth of Oceana*, 1656, both of which aimed to reform the laws and institutions of England after preconceived models.

The *Leviathan* was an epoch-making work in political philosophy, and its author was the first great English writer to regard government from the standpoint, not of tradition, but of reason. The work is based on the contract theory of the origin of the state, which originated in the later Greek philosophy, and which in the hands of Rousseau a century later became a mighty popular philosophy and revolutionary force. But this contract theory was held by Hobbes in a form that was peculiar to himself. In its original form it signified an agreement between ruler and people, which is now known as the governmental contract. The social contract, on the other hand, the kind of contract championed by Hobbes, is an agreement among a number of equal individuals by means of which a body politic is created in the first instance. Thus while the agreement is between individual men in the social contract, in the governmental contact it is between a group of individuals on

the one side and a superior being or sovereign on the other. In the social contract again this superior being exists only by virtue of the pact; in the governmental contract he exists prior to it.

According to Hobbes man is a selfish and self-seeking animal, who is always at war with his fellows, and who has no other motive for his actions than the wish to satisfy his own appetites and desires. Moved after a time by the desire of escaping from the evils of this state of nature, which grows increasingly intolerable with the growth of population in numbers and density, men equal by nature agree with one another to resign their natural rights to a common beneficiary, who becomes by virtue of such an agreement their superior, although he is not himself a party to the contract. Thus there is created for mutual profit "that great Leviathan called the Commonwealth or State, which is but an artificial man, though of greater stature and strength than the natural, for whose protection and defense it was intended."

A second important feature of Hobbes's doctrine of the social contract is that the choice of the sovereign, although determined by a majority of those entering into the compact, is binding upon all. It follows from this that a dissatisfied minority can have no just ground for resisting the sovereign. Thus Hobbes reaches the principle that all political power, however absolute, rests upon the original consent of the governed. This looks like good democratic doctrine, and the democratic principle of popular sovereignty is precisely what Rousseau extracted from the contract theory as its main product. But Hobbes arrived at a different result because he followed up his first principle with another that destroyed all its democratic virtue. From the hypothetic fact that the sovereign was no party to the compact Hobbes reasoned that no act of his, however unjust his rule, could invalidate it. The compact is equally irrevocable on the side of the covenanters who in the act of entering into it surrendered all their natural rights reserving none to themselves. But if the compact can be revoked by no act either of the sovereign or of

the covenanters, then its logical and necessary outcome is an absolute monarchy. Thus by a process of political alchemy all his own Hobbes obtains from a mass of free and equal individuals the concept of an omnipotent state.

It must not be inferred, however, from the fact that Hobbes advocated absolute monarchy as the only proper form of government, that he justified tyranny. On the contrary he was careful to enjoin upon monarchs a government of just laws; and such a government, he argued, would be more likely to be attained if the supreme power was vested in one person rather than in many, for the reason that the selfish aims of the one must in the nature of the case be sooner satiated than those of the many.

Of the authority and significance of the *Leviathan* much might be said. It has been called an epoch-making work, and justly so, for it led political thinking into new channels. And yet it is no light task to realize the full measure of its great influence on its age at this late day, when the doctrine of the social contract has long been dismissed from all serious political thinking. When Hobbes wrote the *Leviathan* England was distracted by political disorders, and his purpose in writing it was to bring peace and quiet to the nation by showing that every sovereign ruler is and ought to be absolute, and that resistance to his will, whether prompted by religion, as it was in England in the seventeenth century, or any other motive, can be nothing else than illogical, immoral and destructive to society; and that, furthermore, as the social contract was the only way, in the first instance, of ending the state of war which was inseparable from the state of nature, so it was the only remedy for the civil anarchy and other ills from which England was suffering. It cannot be doubted that the *Leviathan* rendered material assistance in the restoration of the Stuart line to the English throne. But it had also a wider and more remote influence. The almost universal acceptance of its conception of the social contract had the effect of completely overthrowing both the religious and the patriarchal theories of the state, on which kings had founded their claims of absolute authority for

so many centuries. Even if it had done nothing more than lay a new foundation for political absolutism it would have been something of a gain to have unsettled the old foundations. And then, most important of all, it has made a lasting contribution to political philosophy in its theory of sovereignty, the superstructure of which—not the historical foundations on which it was originally reared—has passed through Bentham into current English thought.

The *Oceana* differs from the *Leviathan* in two important respects. In the first place, while the latter “in the name of materialism invites men to servitude,” the former “appeals to man’s moral dignity and urges him on to the conquest of liberty.” The second difference grows out of the first. While the *Leviathan* champions an absolute monarchy as the ideal government for England, the *Oceana* proposes a republic.

The style of the *Oceana* bears a certain resemblance to that of the *Utopia*. There is also some similarity of contents, although in a number of important respects the two differ materially. This is notably the case in the matter of private property. While the *Utopia* advocates communism, the *Oceana* leaves the principle of private property untouched.

The work is extremely prolix entering into the minutest details of government. It was dedicated to Cromwell, who was to institute the new scheme of government proposed in it, but who was so far from being pleased with its contents, that after reading it he is said to have declared that what he had won by the sword he would not suffer himself to be scribbled out of. On the other hand, the patent fact that the work was dedicated to Cromwell, and the equally patent fact of its extreme republican sentiments, which could not be veiled behind a fanciful nomenclature or a romantic dress, were little calculated to win the favor of the Stuart type of royalty. In fact almost as soon as Charles II. ascended the throne Harrington was arrested and imprisoned. While the technical charge of treason was entered against him, he was never either tried or liberated. He died in prison in 1677 after he had been for some years violently insane.

In his inquiry concerning the best form of government Harrington lays down the dictum that government must be "either the empire of laws and not of men or the empire of men and not of laws." In the one case the public interest, in the other some private interest, is made the end of the state. The former principle is the one which Harrington adopts for his ideal commonwealth. This point settled, he proceeds to inquire into the principles which must underlie a government whose end is the general public interest. His conclusion is that a government is good or bad, desirable or undesirable, in the degree that it is stable, and that stability in turn depends on the degree in which political power is vested in the property-owning class. That is to say, if property is mostly in the hands of one person, then an absolute monarchy is the natural and proper form of government; if in the hands of a few, the government should be a limited monarchy; and where it is widely distributed, a republic is the best government. In short, property, and particularly landed property, should be the basis of political power; and when the two do not correspond, when the supreme power is in the hands of the one, the few or the many, regardless of the ownership of property, the government is in essence a tyranny, an oligarchy or an anarchy, according as the one, the few or the many have usurped power.

The reason why Harrington advocates a republic as the best form of government is because it corresponds most closely with man's rational nature. This, he maintains, may be seen by observing a group of men debating a matter of common concern. Two parts are at once discernible, a smaller body which proposes ideas and measures, and a larger one which merely passes on the proposals of the other. In this fact of common observation Harrington finds his clue to the structure of government. There must be first, he says, "a senate embracing that natural aristocracy diffused by God throughout the whole body of mankind, whose function is to originate policies and laws; second, a council consisting of the mass of the people or their representatives, with the function of passing upon the

propositions of the senate; and, third, a magistracy to carry into effect the resolutions adopted by the assemblies."

To insure the permanence of such a government it is necessary, first, to prevent the concentration of property in the hands of a few or of one. To this end Harrington limits by an immutable law the amount of land which any one may own to so much as will yield an annual revenue of two thousand pounds. In the interest of political equality, again, all the magistrates are chosen by popular election and limited to a term of three years, a third part retiring from office each year. But after an interim of three years they may be elected again.

Because of his visionary views Harrington has had comparatively little influence on political thought and practice, much less, indeed, than is his due. It is not to be denied that the *Oceana* has in it much that is purely chimerical, and not a little that would be undesirable even if it were not chimerical. *But it also contains ideas and principles of lasting value, and that they have not been altogether without influence upon the greatest republic the world has ever known, may be seen from the frequent references made to them by leading American statesmen, notably John Adams and Daniel Webster.* Some of these ideas and principles have long been embodied in the laws and institutions of the most advanced democracies of our own time. Others are still waiting to be realized. Politically Harrington lived before his time. So far, indeed, was he in advance of his age that his principle of the secret ballot as all-essential to a just and popular government has been realized only in the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the most casual reader of the *Oceana* will not fail to notice that while its state is based on the principle of popular sovereignty its government is essentially aristocratic. This combination of a democratic state with an aristocratic government is not at all inconsistent with democracy. It represents in fact the highest and best aspirations of modern democracy, for it combines, as no other political scheme does, freedom and efficiency. But it is still only an ideal. Perhaps the twentieth century may give it realization.

The French utopias of the seventeenth century resemble

those of England in being for the most part of a purely political character. While both reflect the political conditions of their time, the French utopias are a product of a system of unbroken state absolutism, such as was unknown in England in the seventeenth century; and consequently they breathe, as the English utopias do not, the atmosphere of revolution. But along with this quality of violence and destruction they exhibit also a striking tendency to return to Plato and More. Thus Vairasse's *La République des Sévérambes*, 1677, is little more than an echo of More. Mezlier's *Le Testament*, 1690, is a more thinly veiled denunciation of the abuses of the French state system, the only remedy for which is declared to be communal autonomy. Fenelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, 1699, is a classical romance based on communism. It was not written for the public but for the moral instruction of the Duke of Burgundy, grandson of Louis XIV. and Fenelon's pupil. Its surreptitious publication through the treachery of Fenelon's secretary cost its author the favor of Louis, who recognized in it a thinly veiled satire against his autocratic rule. The work contains, along with much extraneous matter, a description of the republic of Salente, whose inhabitants are representing as living a simple agricultural life and having attained the highest degree of perfection and happiness. But despite its simplicity of life, Salente is an aristocratic state, and its citizens are divided into seven classes, one of them determined by birth and all distinguished by their rights, occupations, conditions and clothing. All this is very similar to the *Republic*, so much so that Salente has been called the ideal commonwealth of Plato modified only by Christian morals and by prejudices of race borrowed from feudalism. Among its leading political and economic doctrines, are the following: a limited monarchy, a written constitution, one sovereign law for all, universal education provided by the state, the reciprocal independence of the temporal and spiritual powers, the wrongfulness of war, and free industry in agriculture and trade. A utopian scheme indeed for the France of Louis XIV.!

LANCASTER, PA.

IX.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

GOD IN CHRIST.

The first evidence that the disciples recognized that Jesus was "the Christ," is found in Peter's answer to the question, "But who say ye that I am?" He was still far from comprehending the nature of Christ's person or the character of His mission. Yet he and his associates, after days and months of fellowship with their Master, were convinced that from Him would come the blessings of Jehovah for which the Jews had been waiting for centuries. They began to realize that Jesus was the official representative of God, and that through Him God would introduce the long-expected Messianic reign. The highest tribute that could be paid to Jesus at that stage of His life was the confession of Peter. At the same time the popular conception of a Messiah and a Messianic kingdom must have undergone a change in the apostle's mind. The old terms, which were current among the Jews for generations, were filled with a new content. Jewish words were given Christian meaning.

It was indeed the miracle of miracles when, by the influence of His life, powerful, irresistible, and magnetic, Jesus convinced a small circle of followers that He, "the carpenter, son of Mary and brother of James and Jude and Simon," was the Christ, the hope of the Jews, "the desire of all nations," the one whom "prophets and righteous men desired to see." The devout Jew, however much he might elaborate and refine traditional Messianic ideals, would hardly have looked for the fulfilment of national hopes and aspirations in Nazareth. The Greek, speculating about a mediating being between God and man, could not have been convinced by argument that the

divine Logos was embodied in an accessible and winning personality—a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. The reason that men called Jesus “the Christ” and the “Logos” must be found in His unique nature and character. He recognized the legitimacy of the aspirations of men as expressed in prophecy and philosophy. He was not, however, a creation of human hopes and fears but God’s response to them in a wholly unexpected yet soul-satisfying form.

The full significance of Peter’s confession was only gradually understood. Christ’s unfolding life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and spiritual presence in the disciples, were a continuous revelation of His person and mission. They understood Him when they knew Him not “after the flesh,” but in the spirit (2 Cor. 5: 16). The more they saw of Him and lived with Him, the more they were convinced that He belonged to the divine, and not merely to the human, sphere. This conviction was practically universal in the primitive Christians and finds expression in a variety of forms. It is true the apostolic writers were far from the metaphysical problems which confronted the Nicene Fathers, but they bear incontrovertible testimony to their belief in the divine character of Jesus—divine not simply as having the image of God on His soul, but as having a unique relation to God as well as a unique position and mission among men.

So much is undoubtedly taught by the infancy narratives in the gospels of Matthew and Luke, which contain in beautiful, historical symbolism the early Christian conceptions of Christ. What is here found in stories is repeated under different circumstances, for a different purpose, and in different language in the epistles. “This Jesus whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2: 36). He is “the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” “the image of the invisible God,” “the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father,” “the effulgence of His glory and the very image of His substance.” It is needless, indeed, to multiply passages to prove that Jesus did beget in the hearts of His followers the irrepressible conviction that God was in Christ and was reconciling the world unto Himself.

Who, however, had this faith? Surely not all those who heard Him nor all who heard His apostles. There was as wide a difference in the views men had of Him in Palestine in the first century as there is in Europe and America in the twentieth. His townsmen spoke of Him as "the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James" (Mark 6: 3). They could not see the glory of God in their former playmate, companion, and neighbor. Herod, the conscience-stricken king, cried, "John the baptizer is risen from the dead" (Mark 6: 14). The scribes said, "He hath Beelzebub and by the prince of the demons casteth he out demons" (Mark 3: 22). His friends even, in all kindness, went out to lay hold on Him, for they said, "He is beside himself." There was, also, an outer circle of disciples who saw Him from afar and caught a glimpse of His dignity and power, and declared that He was "Elijah or one of the prophets."

Why did some men find Jesus to be the Christ, Lord, God? Why did the disciples know Him, while the world knew Him not? Why could not Jesus convince all men that He was the Christ?

Those to whom He addressed the question, "But who say ye that I am?" and from whom He received a satisfactory and decisive answer, had been in His presence as disciples and companions for a comparatively long time. They saw His mighty deeds and heard His wondrous words in public. They communed with Him in private. They were constantly under the benign influence of His presence. They began to see God and men and the world through His eyes. They measured life with His standards, cherished His hopes, glowed with His love, worked with His faith. True, only a ray of glory broke into their souls here and there, now and then; but it sufficed to convince them that he was more than Elijah, the Baptist, or a prophet; yea, none other than the Christ.

For Jesus did not simply teach them things about God, like the prophets of old, but He lived the life of God in human form in their presence. When Philip said unto Him, "Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," He did not point

to the heavens above or the depths beneath, or to the soul within. But He cried, "Have I been so long time with you and dost thou not know me, Philip?" (John 14: 8-9). He was astounded that those who were in fellowship with Him failed to know Him. He did not attempt to prove His Messiahship by argument. Much less did He demand acceptance of dogmatic statements about Himself. He lived His life, proclaimed His message, and had supreme confidence that He would generate a new life in men. And only when "born anew," could they "see the kingdom of God."

The Christology of the epistles is the fruit of the apostles' personal experience of redemption and sanctification. Before Paul wrote to the Ephesians and the Colossians he passed through the struggle which he describes in the seventh chapter of Romans. He sounded the depths of human misery, and cried "Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" He tasted the power of God unto salvation and triumphantly exclaimed, "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7: 25). Christ became his Saviour; all that he was and held more precious than the world itself, he received from Him. "It is no longer I that live but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2: 20). The contents of Jesus' *historical* life among men cannot be measured save in the light of His *glorified* life in men. Having once found Jesus as his Saviour—"the power of God and the wisdom of God"—Paul was prepared to interpret the relation of Christ to Judaism and the Old Testament, to Gentilism and human history, to creation, salvation, and the destiny of the race. In what other terms can a man, to whom Christ is all in all, construe the universe, visible and invisible, but in the language of Christology? He sees God through Christ. Christ is for him the principle of creation, of providence, of human progress, the center and goal of the universe. But only those who share, in a measure at least, Paul's experience will find satisfaction with his Christological and cosmological speculations. As of old, so now, to the Jew they are a stumbling block, to the Greek foolishness. Present Paul's conclusions to a modern

audience in whom the Pauline experience is wanting, and what can you expect but that they will do what the Athenians did when the apostle addressed them on the Areopagus. "Some mocked, but others said we will hear thee concerning this yet again" (Acts 7: 32). Even if some would give assent to his doctrine it would have no ethical value in their lives before they have the spirit of Christ, even the obedience of faith. Paul is especially clear on this point when he writes to the Greeks of Corinth, the representatives of intellect and culture. "In the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God. It was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of things preached to save them that believed" (1 Cor. 1: 20). Only "unto them that are called, both Jews and Gentiles, is Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Has not, perchance, the way of finding God in Jesus changed since the days of the apostles? Or must we still come to Him in the spirit of children, follow Him in faith, and through Him obtain our vision of the Father? The fund of knowledge has been immensely enlarged. Men know vastly more of the universe, of the history of the race, of man's body and mind, of religion, science and art than they did in the first century; but among our new methods of investigation, our discoveries and inventions, there is not found a more excellent way to a knowledge of the contents of personality than by mutual faith and love. A child only can know a mother, a friend only can understand a friend, a Christian only can know Christ. Jesus to some may still appear as a carpenter, to others as a teacher, to others as a prophet. Their vision depends on their ethical nearness to, or farness from, Him. He is and can be Lord and God only to those who have found in Him deliverance from the world and the freedom of the sons of God.

One of the principal contributions of the Reformers was the place they gave to Jesus as the exclusive source of knowledge of God. They protested against a false reliance on philosophy, tradition, mystic dreams, and fanatical vagaries. Luther said, "What men think of God apart from Christ are

merely worthless thoughts and vain idolatry." They restored, after centuries of oblivion, the original meaning of Math. 11: 27: "All things have been delivered unto me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." In answer to Question 31 of the Heidelberg Catechism Jesus is called the Christ because (1) He fully reveals to us the sacred counsel and will of God concerning our redemption; (2) He hath redeemed us and ever liveth to make intercession for us; (3) He governs us by His Word and Spirit, and defends and preserves us in the redemption obtained for us. The answer presumes that we can know Christ only when He has become our personal Saviour and Lord.

That these principles of evangelical Christianity are still held and proclaimed in the land of Luther, by men whose mastery of the methods and results of modern scholarship no one will question, the following quotations prove. Prof. Herrmann, of Marburg, perhaps the most influential teacher of Systematic Theology in Germany, if not in the world, and classed as a Ritschlian, says: "For a man understands that experience of the Person of Jesus if it comes upon him as the unmistakable touch of a supernatural Power full of life and truth. Whatever he may have heard before about God in other ways, he will now for the first time know that he has found God himself. For now he not only cherishes thoughts about God which others have handed down to him or which he himself excogitated; he lives in the midst of an experience in which he traces God working upon him. In what he experiences of the Person of Jesus the Christian becomes certain that the Power of the good not only judges but redeems him. Thus Christian faith is created. It is simply the trust that Jesus wins from us by His personal love and the ensuing joyful submission to the God Who manifests Himself in Him and works upon us through Him. Such a faith in itself saves" (*Faith and Morals*, Eng. Trans., pp. 44 to 45). I. Clasen, a liberal pastor near Magdeberg, writes: "Faith in

Christ, the Son of God, is not the beginning but the end, not the foundation but the capstone of our trust in Jesus." In the last paragraph of his article on "What Think Ye of Christ" he summarizes his conclusion as follows: "Neither the Lord Himself nor His disciples demand faith in the deity of Christ before the experience of redemption as a condition of becoming a Christian. Profession of faith in His deity is in all cases the result of that which the believer, in communion with his Lord, has experienced. Those who have come to know Jesus as their Redeemer, and have been assured of God's grace in Him, will doubtless confess that they have found God in Christ, that He is the only begotten Son" (*Hefte zur Christlichen Welt*, Nr. 8, 1893). The Reformed theologian of Erlangen, Karl Müller, in a tract entitled *Unser Herr*, page 16, says: "In general a man will think so much of Christ as in the time of personal need he has experienced of Him. In uncritical times many a meaningless statement may be accepted and considered essential, but only that is actually valuable which authenticates itself to Christian experience."

Notwithstanding these positive testimonies about Jesus, it is evident to the casual reader of books and periodicals of Europe and America, that theological controversy centers on the Christological problem. The paramount question of our age is, "Who say ye that I am?" Some build their hopes on the discovery of an "historical Jesus"; others on the Christ of the apostles, and not a few accept unaltered the dogmatic definitions of the Catholic Fathers. This theological unrest is doubtless a necessary consequence of the difference between the ancient and the modern views of the world and of life. Men keenly feel the contradiction between many doctrines that have been taught by the Church as essential elements of the Christian faith, and the undeniable results of scientific and historical investigations. It is hard to make Genesis square with geology; to hold to verbal inspiration in the light of biblical criticism; to reconcile predictive prophecy with the genetic view of revelation; to coördinate the revelation of Jesus and the teachings of Paul with the dogmas of Greek Catholicism.

What are Christians to do in a crisis like this? Some may stubbornly oppose every attempt to adjust ancient dogmas to the unquestionable results of modern exegesis and to the Christian consciousness of this age. They may resort to the repressive measures of the Index and the Inquisition to maintain intact traditional theories of the Bible, the Christ and the Church. Others, on the contrary, in their zeal for science sacrifice Genesis; in their confidence in historical development lose faith in prophecy; in denying verbal infallibility reject the infallible Word; in seeking the Jesus of history fail to find the Christ of glory; in protesting against the Chalcedonian dogma make their peace with a religious genius.

There is a theological dogmatism and a scientific dogmatism—both equally incapable of finding God in Christ and of showing men the Saviour in Jesus. Neither reactionism nor radicalism has the solution for the problems at issue. We have as little to hope for from the discovery and restoration of a so-called historical Jesus behind the synoptic gospels as from the metaphysical definitions of the Christ of dogma. In the last chapter of his notable study of the lives of Christ, entitled *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, Albert Schweitzer makes a statement that is worthy of careful consideration. “Not Jesus historically known but Jesus spiritually risen in men, can have significance for, and bring help to, our age. Not the historic Jesus but the spirit which proceeds from Him and abides in men, controlling them and inspiring them for new forms of activity, is the Conqueror of the World.”

The Christ, who is the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation, is found in the consciousness of His first disciples, the classic expression of which is contained in the New Testament writings. We shall share in the apostolic power and wisdom when we enter into believing fellowship with the Christ of the apostolic Scriptures. This union is not effected by critical analysis, by philosophical speculation, nor even by moral effort, but by the spirit of Christ taking possession of the mind and heart of those who “repent and believe the gospel.” Thus the Kingdom of God—the dominion of God’s will in

men's lives—at first came and still comes into the world. To know Jesus as our Saviour and the Way to the Father we need not be masters of Biblical criticism and theology. Prof. H. Weinel says: "We do not mean that the simple average man who desires to become acquainted with Jesus needs to tread the path of learned investigation. For it is precisely the greatness of Jesus, and the peculiarity of the tradition concerning him, that every one of his brief sayings and every one of his parables and of the stories concerning him displays his inner character entire, and displays it so clearly, that even the unlearned man may receive from it the deepest impression" (*The Hibbert Journal Supplement*, 1909, p. 43).

The blessings of the Kingdom were not in the beginning determined or conditioned by scientific knowledge, philosophical systems, ethical codes, aesthetic culture, or political and social order. Men of all classes and conditions believed in Him and "believing had life in His Name." It did not take long, however, before the men who lived His life began to think about Christ in His relation to the Hebrew religion, Greek philosophy, Roman law, the origin of the world, the history of the race and the end of the world. Every phase of human thought and activity was related to the Christ. Thus began Christian theology and philosophy.

The history of theology is a record of the heroic efforts men made from time to time to adjust the Gospel to the religions, philosophies, cults, and social institutions of the nations. We find the results of these struggles in the forms of the ancient Catholic, the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the Protestant Churches. Each of these has its distinctive cultus, polity and doctrine. For centuries each claimed to be the Church of Christ to the exclusion of the others. Now we are beginning to recognize that all of them, to a greater or less degree, are historical embodiments of the Gospel, and yet none of them is a final and perfect expression of it. We must, therefore, distinguish between Christ and His Kingdom on the one hand, and the successive ecclesiastical interpretations on

the other. The former are the same, yesterday, to-day and forever. The latter will change from age to age. The failure to make this distinction has brought endless trouble to the Church. Men's consciences have been burdened unnecessarily by antiquated systems and their souls languished for a lack of the life-giving Word. Men have confused the form and the substance, the earthen vessel and the heavenly treasure. They have tried to find God in Christ by the methods of historical criticism, philosophical speculation, or ecclesiastical services, and were disappointed; "for no man knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." The conditions of this revelation are stated in the verses which follow: "Come unto me . . . Take my yoke upon you and learn of me" (Math. 11: 27-30).

It will be conceded that we are now in a transition period in the history of the Western world; about passing from mediaevalism to modernism. We accept the Copernican view of the universe, the evolutionary theory of creation, the scientific method of study, the democratic form of government, and the industrial order of society. It has therefore become an historical necessity now, as it formerly was in Greece and Rome, to interpret the facts of the Christian revelation and the contents of the Christian consciousness in the thought-forms of a new age—hence a new theology, but not a new God; a new Christology but not a new Christ; a new creed but not a new faith; a new eschatology but not a new hope, a new form of worship and administration but not a new spirit of life and service. In the process of reconstruction we do not ask science and philosophy who Christ was; but we proclaim Christ to science and philosophy as He has revealed Himself in His Word and in His Church. Nor is the nature of the Kingdom to be determined by modern theories of government and society. These, on the contrary, are to be brought into subjection to Christ and to be controlled by His Spirit. So far as he speculates about the universe, Christ is still for the Christian the principle of creation, the motive of providence and the crown of the world process—the Alpha and the Omega.

We believe that the greatest problem of the Church is a more complete surrender of Christians to Christ, and a more consistent application of the principles of the Gospel in the individual and the social life—a *moral, not an intellectual, problem*. Men will believe that God is in Christ when they see Christ in the Christian. In an article on “The Religious Problem of the Present,” Professor Herrmann makes an almost startling assertion. “When in a nation religion is actually on the decline, it is not in man’s power to maintain it. Whoever attempts that need not be astonished if he ends a miserable failure. We can at best only have a care that the light continues to burn brightly in our own souls. Then we may hope that to others alongside of us the way to God will be opened, while we ourselves are finding, and going on, it.” The Church has been rich in theology, organization, rituals and ordinances; but to what a comparatively small degree has the Gospel been lived by men. Truly, in the words of Mr. Chamberlain, “Christianity is still in the stage of infancy (*auf seinen Kindheitsfüßen*).” And men say it is outlived! Better say we have not begun to live it. Think of the barren dogmatism of the patristic period, the crude superstitions of the Middle Ages, the lifeless orthodoxy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the secularism and industrialism of the nineteenth and twentieth. Before we stand in judgment on Jesus, His nature, His Gospel, the absoluteness of His religion, ought we not to give Him a fair test in our own lives and in the life of the social organism of which we are a part? Perhaps then we “may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God.”

G. W. R.

X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY. Publication Board of the Reformed Church, 15th and Race Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. Pages 316. Price \$1.00.

The fourth volume of the Swander Memorial Lectures has made its appearance under the above title. It is published under the direction of the Faculty of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa. The preface to the book is of special interest and value. It presents for the first time "The Swander Lectureship Foundation." Its special interest consists in the fact that the "Foundation" is a perpetual memorial of sanctified, sorrowful affection. "It is to be known as 'The Sarah Ellen and Nevin Ambrose Swander Lectureship.'" Thus it enshrines and hallows the parents' memory of an only daughter and an only son; the former departing this life in her eighteenth year, the latter on the eve of his majority. A memorial of such a sacred character is worthy of most sacred regard.

The special value of the "Foundation" consists in the fact that it perpetually contributes to the enrichment of religious literature by means of courses of lectures to be delivered by members of the seminary faculty, and others whose services may be secured under their appointment. "While the Faculty shall guard diligently against the admission of anything into these memorial volumes at variance with the truth as it is in Jesus, they are not to be held responsible for the views of the individual lecturers."

"The Swander Lectureship Foundation" is the first of its kind in the history of the Reformed Church in the United States. Its sacred purpose and beneficent aim entitle it to most grateful appreciation, not only on the part of all who are directly interested in the theological seminary at Lancaster, but also on the part of the ministry and people of the Reformed Church generally. It is of great value because it is a "Foundation" on which shall be built a literature that shall bear the imprint of the spirit and life of the mother institution of the Reformed Church, as well as of the denomination which it represents. In this respect it will fulfill an important and specific mission. The value of the fund cannot now be duly estimated. Its worth will be in proportion to the value of the volumes which shall appear successively throughout the years to come.

This third volume of the series, contributed by Dr. Swander, will be welcomed by many as a book of more than ordinary interest. It rings with strong echoes of the Mercersburg Theology of which it treats. The author, on every page, gives manifest proof that he is in love with his theme. He shows familiarity with

every stage of the history of the Mercersburg School of Theology. The great leaders, Rauch, Nevin, Schaff, and their successors, are summoned to bear witness by their literary contributions to the strength and the wide sweep of theological thought represented by the Mercersburg movement. The comprehensiveness of the Mercersburg system appears in the titles of the several chapters. Quite interesting, indeed, are the biographical sketches of the founders, which open the way for the direct treatment of the system itself, presented in fourteen chapters, on the following subjects: Mercersburg Philosophy, Anthropology, Christology, Ecclesiology, Soteriology (three chapters), Mercersburg Conception of Christian Cultus (three chapters), Sociology, Eschatology. The chapters on Soteriology and Christian Cultus include, in broad outline, the Liturgical Controversy.

The author lays special emphasis upon the cardinal principle of the Mercersburg system—historical development. In the light of this principle he shows how, consistently with its own claims, Mercersburg Theology gave full warrant for the advanced and advancing thought of some of its later disciples; that theology, like all the other sciences, is, and must ever be, progressive; and, inferentially, if not directly, that no system of theological doctrines, however valuable it may have been for the age or ages which produced it, can serve as an adequate standard for succeeding ages. Mercersburg Theology, therefore, was not a finality. With all its masterly strength, it represented but a stage, an advanced stage, in the general history and progress of theological science; and thus opened and prepared the way for the better things to come.

Dr. Swander speaks with the accent of conviction. He is not simply a reviewer of the history of Mercersburg theology; he is a fearless and most valiant champion of the principles which constitute the basis of the Mercersburg System. Rather naively does he disclose his own attitude in a statement which appears in the opening chapter: "An author is not obliged by any law of literary ethics to disguise himself in order to keep his person in the background."

The book has special value because it presents, in strong, clear, outline, the distinctive thought of the Mercersburg School in the palmy days of its history. Carefully chosen paragraphs from the writings of its leading exponents, define the attitude of Mercersburg toward the great doctrinal questions of the period. Mercersburg was a "school" of theology, a "school" of philosophy. The terms may be used interchangeably; for its theology was philosophical and its philosophy was theological. But whether viewed from a theological or philosophical standpoint, it was a "school." This was its distinction. It had its masters and its following of intensely devoted disciples; and its influence was felt and acknowledged both within and without its immediate circle.

It shaped, in large measure, the thought of the Reformed Church, and in no small degree contributed to the shaping of the thought of its own age, and to the reshaping of the thought at the present time. As a "school" it did its work; it had its day. To the mind of Dr. Swander it was a most glorious day. Not the least service, perhaps, which it rendered was that, directly or indirectly, it prepared its descendants to face and take faithful part in the theological conflict of the present day, involving, as it does, issues no less significant and momentous than those of the stormy period of Rauch, Nevin, Schaff and their cotemporaries.

Only a small edition of "The Mercersburg Theology" has been published. The "Foundation" of the lectureship, as described in the preface, and the title of the book, together with the merits of its content, should commend the work to our ministers and intelligent laity.

JOHN C. BOWMAN.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ABOUT THE FUTURE. By Henry Burton Sharman, Ph.D., Instructor on New Testament History and Literature in the University of Chicago. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press. Pages 382. Price, postpaid, \$3.26.

In a preliminary definition, the author defines the term "future," as used in the title. It covers the time subsequent to the final severance of relations between Jesus and his disciples. All that portion of his teaching which refers to his rejection, sufferings, death, resurrection and appearances after the resurrection, is hence excluded.

Just one hundred pages, nearly one third of the entire work, are devoted to a discussion of the sources which lie back of the Synoptic Gospels. This we fear will prove a stumbling-block to many readers; for the chapter is by no means easy or entertaining reading. The author accepts Professor Burton's analysis of the Synoptic Gospels, which, unlike the usual two-document theory, finds four main sources back of our present Matthew and Luke. These four sources Dr. Sharman has attempted to reproduce, and he has given the results of his effort on separate sheets, which are found in a pocket attached to the cover. These restored documents are interesting to every student of the Synoptic problem; and they will be found helpful to any one who attempts to follow the author's extended and minute analysis of the teaching of Jesus about the future. But they are conjectural only; as they necessarily must be, since they are attempts at the reproduction of documents which no one, at least in this generation, has ever seen. The analysis, on which they rest, is, to say the least, not generally accepted; and hence the conclusions, which are made to rest upon a comparison of one of the documents with the others, will naturally be received with a considerable degree of reserve.

As an example of Dr. Sharman's method, we may perhaps cite his use of the *Logia* of Matthew, mentioned by Papias. Unlike other students of the Synoptic problem, he finds these only in the first Gospel. By comparing it with his other supposed documents, he finds it to contain a strong eschatological tendency (p. 35); and hence he concludes that Matthew is largely responsible for the eschatological coloring found in the parables and the teaching of Jesus. The result is that a considerable portion of what has been usually supposed to be the teaching of Jesus is eliminated; so that in summing up his discussion on the day of judgment, the author on page 248 says: "Stated summarily, the results that seem to have been reached show that none of these statements of judgment are from Jesus, except the sayings about Chorazin and Bethsaida and about the men of Nineveh and the queen of Sheba 'in the judgment.' Even when taking these over from the document P (*i. e.*, the Perean document), the evangelist Matthew changed the phrase to 'the day of judgment' in the case of Chorazin and Bethsaida. It is apparently to that same Matthean tendency (using Matthean in the comprehensive sense of document M, evangelist Matthew, and later workers on the Gospel of Matthew) that there is to be assigned the origin of every other saying about the judgment, except, perhaps, the promise of judicial functions to the Twelve in the Gospel of Luke."

Again, in concluding his analysis of the teaching of Jesus on Gehenna, he says, "Unless the evidence has been wrongly interpreted, the necessary conclusion from the foregoing results is that Jesus never used Gehenna in any other sense than the valley of Hinnon, that is, the valley of Hinnon as the depository of the offal of Jerusalem, the carcasses of animals, and the bodies of criminals who by the special nature of their crimes were refused burial so sacred to the Jews. Wherever Gehenna appears in any other sense in the Gospels, most especially where it is conceived of as the place of future and eternal punishment, the comparative study of the documents seems to show with clearness that this sense is derived by subsequent modification of the original words of Jesus" (pp. 262, 263).

Surely, before accepting such conclusions, one will want to be sure that the documents, on the comparison of which they are based, are really documents which once had an existence, and that we are not reasoning from conjectural premises which rest simply on an unproved theory.

Dr. Sharman has bestowed a great deal of labor on his work; and his analyses show great ingenuity and skill. His work is scholarly; and whether one agrees with his conclusions, no one will likely undertake hereafter an exhaustive study of the great eschatological discourse without consulting his work. Yet we question whether his conclusions will meet with general accept-

ance. They certainly present much of the teaching of Jesus in a new light; and until his theory as to the sources of the Gospels, on which his whole work rests, has been proven, it is not likely that his conclusions will meet with general acceptance.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

GENESIS. By Hinckley G. Mitchell, Ph.D., D.D. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1909. Pages 379. Price 90 cents net.

This volume belongs to Professor Shailer Matthews' "The Bible for Home and School." It is the first of the series belonging to the Old Testament.

Like the rest of the series, this volume is intended "to place the results of the best modern scholarship at the disposal of the general reader." Critical and exegetical processes have been excluded; and the evident aim has been to place before the reader the assured results of historical investigation.

The author has devoted nearly the whole of his introduction of twenty-seven pages to setting forth the modern critical view with reference to the composition of Genesis; and it is done in such a way that the average reader should have no difficulty in following the discussion, and in gaining a fairly accurate conception of how critical scholarship views the book. The documentary hypothesis is, of course, adopted.

By the use of modern methods, the author has tried to obtain more satisfactory results than are now generally obtained by the average reader; and one does not need to be a Hebrew scholar nor an expert in Old Testament science to follow his discussion with interest and profit. At this day not even the average Sunday-school teacher can afford to be ignorant of the conclusions, which scholars by long and patient study have reached with reference to the origin and character of the Pentateuch; and because this volume gives these results for Genesis in such a clear manner, we commend it to all Bible readers.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

COMMENTARY OF THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS. By Benjamin W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D., Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pages 135. Price 50 cents net.

Like the above, this volume belongs to "The Bible for Home and School" series. It is one of the best of the series so far published, and one of the best of our popular commentaries on this interesting epistle. We know of no commentary which gives a better exposition in so brief a compass.

The introduction covers forty-five pages, and is a scholarly production. It discusses in a fair and candid manner the questions which have been raised by recent criticism with reference to the epistle. In discussing the question of authorship, Dr. Bacon

gives a fine illustration of how the higher criticism may be employed in the defence of the traditional view as well as on the opposite side. On the location of the Galatian churches, the author accepts the South Galatian theory, for which he presents a strong argument. The composition of the epistle is referred to the early period of Paul's eighteen months residence at Corinth. Dr. Bacon hence makes it the earliest of Paul's extant letters.

As in the other volumes of the series, the text of the Revised Version is given, and concurrently with it a handy and helpful analysis of the epistle. The comments are printed on the same page with the text on the lower part of the page. They are generally brief and to the point, yet sufficiently extended to be illuminating and helpful. The volume admirably fulfills the design of the series, that of placing the results of the best modern biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE FUNCTION OF RELIGION IN MAN'S STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE. By George Burman Foster, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Chicago. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press. Pp. 293. Price \$1.10 net.

THE PRECINCT OF RELIGION IN THE CULTURE OF HUMANITY. By Charles Gray Shaw, B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy in New York University. New York, The Macmillan Co. Pages 279. Price \$2.00 net.

It would be difficult to find two books on subjects so closely related more different in form and manner than the two now under review. The points of view are different, and so are the modes of treatment. The one aims to be scientific and historical, the other lays stress on the philosophic standpoint; the one is written in a very attractive style and the author's line of thought is clear and easily followed, the other is heavy reading and the thought is often obscure while the connection between different parts of the argument is not always apparent. And yet there are glimpses of truth in the latter which seem to be entirely beyond the reach of the former, so that, notwithstanding the defects of style and presentation, we have in the latter a more correct evaluation of the contents of religion than the former, with all the ability and skill of its author, is able to afford.

Professor Foster's book is brilliant, but it is sad reading; and it is not surprising that members of the Baptist Church should feel like reading the author out of their fellowship. This may be partly due to the fact that he proceeds altogether from the human standpoint, both in his affirmations and in his negations, and regards religion as purely subjective without reference to any objective order of spiritual realities other than those which spring from man's own life and activity, and if, therefore, the inference is drawn that he recognizes no such order, he alone is to blame for the inference. He is a thorough-going monist and from this stand-

point he makes war upon all the old forms of scientific and religious ideas, and insists that everything of value in human life must come by a process of growth or development from within. Perhaps a few quotations will make his position clear: "There is no such thing as a self-dependent soul freely active or interactive within an organism which we call the body, just as similarly there is no self-dependent deity freely active or interactive within that larger body which we call the cosmos." That is to say, the two are one reality. "It is a psycho-physiological organism with whose self-preservation and self-completion we have to do" (pp. 21 and 22). Moving in this process of self-preservation and self-completion from lower to higher stages the organism encounters conditions which make new powers of interaction with the environment necessary. It needs an eye and it creates one. "Our capacity to see and hear, to feel pleasure and pain, to think, to produce language and art and science and morality—all this the race had to achieve by the sweat of its brow as it tilled life's thorny fields, all this is no easy gift from without but an evolution and creation from within. There is no gift that is not at the same time a task. Has the organism an eye? It grows it. Has it a conscience, an ideal? It grows that too" (p. 44). In the same way primitive man created the gods. "The gods were created for the sake of the most vital practical interests. They were created in the interest of overcoming the evils that beset the human organism and of appropriating the good that would redound to the weal of that organism. . . . Need is the mother of the gods" (pp. 59-60). And the creation of such gods and the development of religion are, therefore, co-extensive with humanity. Priests did not make religion; man made religion and religion made priests. The character of the gods advanced from lower to higher forms as man himself progressed intellectually and morally; the ethical nature of man did not come from the gods, but the ethical nature of the gods came from man. Religion in fact, or man's conception of God, is only the projection of man's own ideals, and these again become inspiring principles in human life leading to loftier purpose and higher attainment.

It is not difficult to see that so much of this scheme as is true, is presented in a one-sided way to such an extent as to vitiate the whole of it. If the organism creates an eye, there is the objective stimulus of light without which the eye would be useless. Language, art, science, and morality, all have their respective orders of environment and stimuli. But religion, which in the nature of the case, looks up to a Higher Power, "an infant crying in the night, an infant crying for the light and with no language but a cry," is thrust back upon itself because there is no spiritual order to stimulate its growing life, or it is forced to do what the author so much deprecates: create something out of nothing. And yet, further on in the book the author writes God with a capital, and

finds room for prayer and worship and the fellowship of the church, in order that, "*both you and I may find encouragement in each other's faith*!" He provisionally admits the historicity of Jesus; but, at the same time, he says that if it should be proved that no such person ever lived, it would practically make no difference. The world might "be more Christian then than now, have more faith, hope, and love, be more sure of the fatherly God, of a brotherly man, of an eternal life, of a purposeful world" (p. 208).

Professor Shaw's style and use of language are peculiar and, we must say, unattractive. He gives abundant evidence of wide reading and his book bristles with allusions and quotations which cover an extensive range of authors in English, French, German, Latin and Greek, in art, science, and philosophy. But he might have made his main points and contentions much clearer and in smaller compass, it seems to us, and gained in force of presentation. His avowed purpose is to define what he calls the "precinct" of religion. His conclusions, however, are put forth as a vindication of "positive religion," which recognizes and requires a spiritual order and a process of divine revelation which finds its highest expression in that form of religion which we call Christianity.

In the first place religion is to be regarded as distinct from science and philosophy, although it appropriates the accomplished results of both. It has its own sphere or precinct in the religious consciousness, and it consists essentially of the self-affirmation of the soul as over against the external world or the order of nature. Religion does not originate in knowledge. Like the sense of beauty, it has its beginning in intuition, and for this reason there is a close relation between art and religion. It must be carefully distinguished from ethics, but there is also an historical connection between morality and religion. It is interesting to compare here what the author has to say with Dr. Foster's statement of the ethical character of the gods. "Worship, in the various stages of its development, evinces an ever-increasing inclination toward the ethical; while universal religion, in the particular form of Christianity, has elaborated a distinct conception of righteousness. . . . It is not impossible to indicate cults which are capable of the immoral, and that under religious sanction. On the other hand, certain forms of ethnic faith have so thoroughly entertained the idea of morality as to exclude that transcendental element which belongs to worship. But these extremes do not represent an 'either-or,' as though religion were called upon to decide either for or against morality. The more satisfactory view represents religion and morality as developing side by side, each aiding the other" (p. 131). The reality of religion requires for it an origin in time, a process of historical development, the incoming of the divine, and the manifestation of "the Son of Man who is also the Son of God, and He makes possible the *communion with*

God, rather than *a communication from Him*. Finally, the full conception of religion requires *a religious world-order* as distinct from the *nature-order* in the bosom of which our natural life develops. This means *antagonism to the world*, and a *spirit of pessimism*, both of which are resolved in the religious life into a higher unity, and an optimistic view of final redemption and perfection.

JOHN S. STAHR.

MYSTICISM: PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORY AND RELATION TO SCRIPTURE, CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Rev. Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D. The German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. Pages 25. Price 25 cents, or \$2.00 per dozen.

The author defines mysticism as "that phase of religious thought and experience which looks to the opening of divine mysteries, and seeks entrance into the holy of holies." The meaning of it is variously interpreted as "immediacy"—direct personal communion with God, "an influx of the divine mind into our mind," "the contact of the universal life with the individual." It is a method by which favored souls hear the divine speech in nature or in religion through experiences that bring them in touch immediately with the profoundest realities after which the human mind in other ways might strive in vain. After showing to what extent great thinkers in science and theology, in the course of history, were affected by mysticism, the author points out the dangers which lurk in it, such as *extravagance* in thought, the exaltation of feeling at the expense of reason and will, a tendency to pantheism and quietism, etc. Over against these tendencies, however, he finds a positive contribution of inestimable value in that emphasis is placed on the legitimate sphere of *faith*, as the inward eye of the soul, opened by the Scriptures, feeling the pulse-beats of the eternal, and catching a glimpse of the garments of God. Religion abounds in mysteries, and in dealing with many of its problems the mystics, in a higher sense even than the poetical, have shown us

"The light that never was on sea or land"

"The true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE SEPARATED LIFE: A BIBLICAL DEFENCE OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST. By John Edwin Whitteker, D.D. With an introduction by Theodore E. Schmauk, D.D. Philadelphia, General Council Publication House, 1522 Arch St. Pages 204.

This is a neat and attractive volume in which Dr. Whitteker discusses the question of questions before the religious world of the present day. He does not pretend to write for critics; he has in mind the earnest believer and the open-hearted inquirer who desire to be

established in their Christian faith and fortified in their Christian life. Is Jesus Christ in reality the Son of God? In seeking for the grounds of a full and satisfactory answer in the affirmative, the author waives critical questions and turns at once to the biblical narrative and to the testimony of the apostles to show how the life and teachings of our Lord were interpreted from the very beginning of Christianity, and how they must be interpreted today if no violence is to be done to the record and to the whole course of history. The book consists of a series of chapters or discourses each of which presents some special phase of our Lord's life and character as a link in the chain or a step in the process of argument by which the author endeavors to establish his theme. The title is taken from the first chapter in which special stress is laid on the fact that among all the sons of men Jesus stands pre-eminent and alone, and His life is separated from all other lives in human history in that His character was unique. This uniqueness appears in the fact that He is self-existent, makes unique prophecies and promises, exercises divine attributes, makes special claims and accepts homage and honors which would be blasphemous and presumptuous in the extreme unless He is divine. In His unfolding life, His mighty works, His saving power, His atoning death, and His glorious resurrection and ascension, the author finds full proof that Jesus Christ is both the Son of Man and the Son of God, a Prince and a Saviour, in whose Name all the ends of the earth shall be blessed.

JOHN S. STAHR.

WHAT IS PRAGMATISM? By James Bissell Pratt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Williams College. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 256. Price \$1.25 net.

We have read this book with unusual interest. The subject is one of the live topics of the day, and Dr. Pratt handles it with a great deal of vigor and clearness. The discussion given it in this volume, of course, does not speak the last word on the subject, for Professor James has since its publication written "A Sequel to Pragmatism," and in other quarters, too, the battle is raging. But we may safely recommend Dr. Pratt's book to all who are interested in the subject, for the author writes with a charming felicity of style, and, it seems to us, with a candor and thoroughness that are quite commendable. We intend to come back to the subject of pragmatism in a future number of the REVIEW, and therefore forbear writing a fuller notice of the book at this time.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE SPIRIT OF YOUTH AND THE CITY STREETS. By Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago. New York, The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue. Pages 162. Price \$1.25 net.

It is very much to be desired that every parent and teacher should read what Miss Addams has to say in the pages of this book. Her broad sympathies, large experience, and keen insight

into the nature and aspirations of young people specially qualify her to give information and make suggestions which ought to prove helpful to all who are interested either in the saving of those who enter the downward path or the healthy growth and moral uplift of those upon whom the future weal of our country depends. The author graphically describes youth in the city, naturally seeking the joy of life and at the same time surrounded by the most subtle forms of temptation. The outcome so frequently is that the foundations of domesticity are wrecked, and stimulated by the quest for adventure the young are led astray into vice and crime, often without a word of warning or the offering of a friendly hand to guide aright. The chapters on the *House of Dreams* and the *Spirit of Youth and Industry* furnish rich material for thought, while the whole book is full of interest.

JOHN S. STAHR.

DAS JUDENCHRISTENTUM IM ERSTEN UND ZWEITEN JAHRHUNDERT. Von Gustav Hoennicke, Dr.Phil., Lic.Theol., Privatdozent an der Universität Berlin. Berlin, Trowitzsch & Sohn, Wilhelmstrasse 29. Ladenpreis 10 Mk.

The principal problem in the study of the origin and development of ancient Christianity is the relation of Jesus, His gospel, and the primitive Christian communities to Judaism and paganism. That the form of the gospel, at least, was largely determined by the heritage and environment of Jesus, few will deny. That the doctrine, organization, worship and even morality of the churches of the first two centuries were shaped by Jewish and Hellenic ideas and practices, is now generally recognized. Historians differ, however, in their estimate of the relative proportion of the influence of Judaism and Judaizing Christianity on the one hand, and of Hellenism on the other, in the development of ancient Catholicism. In an introductory chapter the author defines the viewpoints and conclusions of the leading church historians from Baur to Ritschl, and from Ritschl to Seeberg—a very helpful sketch for the purpose of orientation.

While much has been written on the relation of the gospel and the early churches to Judaism, a connected and exhaustive account of Jewish Christianity has not yet been attempted. This book, therefore, is to fill a gap in the treatises on Christian origins. The principal points of the four chapters are: (1) Particularism and Universalism in Judaism (non-Christian), (2) the External Conditions of Jewish Christianity (the extent of its spread over Palestine and the empire), (3) the Historical Significance of Judaizing Christianity (*Judaismus*), (4) the Continued Influence of the Religious and Moral Ideals of Jewish Christianity in the Apostolic Fathers. In the conclusion the relation of Jewish Christianity to the origin of the ancient Catholic Church is discussed.

The author does not profess to advance new hypotheses or to make new combinations out of old material. His purpose is to abide by the indisputable facts as given in the sources, and base his conclusions on undoubted evidence. He has also paid special attention to the rabbinical writings and obtains his acquaintance with that unique form of Jewish thought directly from the literary productions of the rabbis. The latest works on the subject, both by Christian and Jewish writers, have been put under tribute. He has, in a measure at least, overcome the oft-repeated objection that Christian historians have neglected to take account of the investigations and conclusions of Jewish scholars in the field of primitive Christianity. A complete index of sources and of subjects is appended.

The marks of thorough German scholarship are in evidence on every page. The author's freedom from a favorite hypothesis relieves the reader of the suspicion that he is adjusting facts to a theory. The comprehensive scope of the treatise, embracing Jewish Christianity from its roots in ancient Judaism to its fruits in ancient Catholicism, makes the book of special value to the student of history.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

HIERONYMUS. Eine Biographische Studie zur Alten Kirchengeschichte. Von Lic. Dr. Georg Grützmacher, A. O. Professor der Theologie. Dritter Band: Sein Leben und Seine Schriften von 400 bis 420. Berlin, S. W., Trowitzsch & Sohn, Wilhelmstrasse 29. Ladenpreis 7 Mk.

The first two volumes of this biography have been noticed in previous numbers of the REVIEW. The third volume completes the author's task, which, it is generally conceded by the critics, has been accomplished *magna cum laude*. He has made a thorough study of the sources, some of which have been only recently discovered, and has mastered an immense mass of material so as to present it in clear style and in a truly historical form. It will doubtless be the standard work on Jerome for years to come, and will supersede the older though not less pretentious treatise on this subject.

In this volume the author describes Jerome's part in the Origenistic Controversy, and the closing years of his life. He endeavors to show that Jerome changed his attitude toward Origenism from one of friendliness to one of hostility, not for politic reasons, but because he began to see, what at first he did not recognize, that the system of the Alexandrine was heterodox and therefore worthy of the severest condemnation. That he failed to understand Origen seems clear; but that did not in any way mitigate the intensity of his opposition. As a controversialist he appears at times bigoted, vain, and self-sufficient, with an unholly zeal for orthodoxy, defects which Grützmacher ascribes to his

Church and his age. One of the results of the controversy was that Jerome ever afterwards considered it his mission to be the guardian and defender of orthodoxy, which he regarded as the *summum bonum* of Christianity.

In his last years, accordingly, he entered into a number of controversies in behalf of sound doctrine—with Augustine, Vigilius, and the Pelagians. Even his exegetical writings are not free from a polemical spirit. The author has made a special study of the commentaries, and points out their historical and theological value. His letters have also been analyzed to throw light on his character and work. A most interesting description of his ascetic ideals and his relation to the monasteries, and especially to the nunnery of his friend Paula, are given near the end of the volume. A complete index of names, subjects and literature is appended.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

AUGUSTINS GEISTIGE ENTWICKELUNG IN DEN ERSTEN JAHREN NACH SEINER "BEKEHRUNG," 386-391. Von Wilhelm Thimme, Lic.Theol. Berlin, S. W., Trowitzsch & Sohn, Wilhelmstrasse 29. Ladenpreis 8 Mk.

The chronology of Augustine's writings and his religious views until his conversion are discussed in the introduction. The auto-biographical account of his life in the *Confessions* is modified and corrected in the light of his later writings.

The body of the book is devoted to a description of the religious development of Augustine in the period from his conversion to his ordination to the priesthood (386-391). The material is presented under the following headings: (1) Augustine's Views on Philosophy and Philosophical Schools; (2) Christianity and Authority; (3) The Conditions of Knowledge; (4) Victory over Skepticism; (5) The Blessed Life; (6) The World Order, First Sketch; (7) The Religion of Augustine at the time of his Baptism; (8) The Ethics of the Philosopher; (9) The Knowledge of God; (10) The World Order, Second Sketch; (11) Hymn on the Truth; (12) The Catholicism of the Anti-Manichean Writings; (13) Blessedness and Love in the First Anti-Manichean Writings.

The author concludes that Augustine did not at once become a Christian through his conversion. He was more in quest of knowledge than of forgiveness in a Christian sense; more a Platonist than a Christian. His writings of this period can be understood only when one remembers that he is wrestling with a specific problem, namely, the conquest of theoretic doubt by working out a rational and idealistic view of the world. Loofs agrees with Thimme on this point when he describes the *Weltanschauung* of this stage of Augustine's life as neo-platonic with a Christian coloring and tendency.

The experience of conversion, however, was a necessary prepa-

ration for his later interpretation of Christianity as a doctrine of redemption. This conception he reached especially during his second residence at Rome where he came under the direct influence of churchly Catholicism.

The author's style is subject to criticism for want of simplicity and perspicuity. At times he obscures his argument by digressions and repetitions. His work, however, is an original and scholarly study of the spiritual development of the most influential of the ancient fathers.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

A COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE BY VARIOUS WRITERS. Edited by The Rev. J. R. Dummelow, M.A., Queen's College, Cambridge. Complete in one volume. With General Articles and Maps. New York, The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue. Pages cliii + 1092. Price \$2.50 net.

This is a volume that will be highly prized by the busy pastor, teacher, and layman as a handbook for ready reference on any particular passage of Scripture that may be under consideration. It is not too brief to be helpful and not too lengthy to be tedious. Its purpose and plan are "to meet the wants of the ordinary Bible reader." The biblical text itself is not printed, so that all the space is used for introductions and comments. Special effort is made to delineate "the circumstances under which the books were composed, the mental habits of the people to whom they were addressed, and the actual needs which they were designed to meet." The comments are prepared by recognized specialists of England and America and take cognizance of the latest results of scholarship.

"Introductions have been supplied to the various books, and notes which will help to explain the principal difficulties, textual, moral or doctrinal, which may arise in connection with them. A series of articles has also been prefixed, dealing with the larger questions suggested by the Bible as a whole. It is the hope that the Commentary may lead to a perusal of many of the books of Holy Scripture which are too often left unread in spite of their rare literary charm and abundant usefulness for the furtherance of the spiritual life."

Twenty-nine articles, covering 152 pages, constitute the general introduction. The following are some of the subjects which will attract the attention of the present-day Bible student: "The Creation Story and Science"; "Genesis and the Babylonian Inscriptions"; "The Laws of Hammurabi"; "The Messianic Hope"; "The Teaching of Jesus Christ"; "The Synoptic Problem"; "The Elements of Religion," etc. A series of seven maps, illustrating biblical history from Joshua to Paul, are found at the end of the volume. The comments on the text are necessarily brief, yet with the small type and the double column on each

page, much valuable material in terse and suggestive form is offered. Fifty pages are given to Genesis, fifty-seven to Psalms, and four hundred and seventy-three to the New Testament. The comments are based on the Authorized Version, since this is still in general use, but "pains have been taken to indicate the innumerable passages where the Revised Version leads to a better understanding of the original." While use is made of the results of modern investigation and criticism, the authors have endeavored to present only the reliable conclusions of scholarship, and have avoided "opinions of an extreme or precarious kind." It is conceded by the editor in the Preface that the conclusions of the several contributors sometimes differ considerably from traditional views, but in such cases it is not only hoped, but believed, that the student will find the spiritual value and authority of the Bible have been enhanced rather than diminished by the change.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

EXPOSITIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Commentary on the Entire Bible, to be completed in Thirty Volumes. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Litt.D. Fourth Series, Six Volumes. Psalms (2 vols.), St. Luke (2 vols.), Ezekiel, Daniel and the Minor Prophets, Romans. Sold only in series. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3 and 5 W. 15th St. 1909. Price \$7.50 net.

Twenty-four volumes of this great expository work have been issued, covering forty-two books of the Bible. The commentary as a whole is well proportioned as appears from the space given to the several books; two volumes to Acts, two volumes to the Psalms, ten volumes to the four gospels, one volume a piece to Genesis, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Romans, and one volume to the Minor Prophets. The excellence of the expositions is remarkably well sustained in each volume. The author is so thoroughly familiar with the Bible and so expert in adapting its lessons to life, that even the less known and interesting parts become attractive and edifying. We have already spoken of his literary style and his homiletical art in previous numbers of the REVIEW. These characteristics are in evidence also on every page of the Fourth Series. Especially valuable are the expositions of the Psalms. The comparatively unknown books of the minor prophets will be read with new interest in the light of Dr. Maclaren's comments.

One more series of six volumes is to come, and the work will be completed. Of its kind it is probably unparalleled in the history of the Church. Other monument than this the author will not need. A more fitting one could not be erected for him, since it is the ripe product of his whole life, the one thing to which he devoted his talents. For the study of the English Bible, for the pastor and preacher, for the Sunday-school teacher and the intelligent layman, this is and will remain one of the most desirable aids which have been published in this generation.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE PREACHER, HIS PERSON, MESSAGE AND METHOD. A Book for the Class Room and Study. By Arthur S. Hoyt, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in the Auburn Theological Seminary. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pages x + 380. Price \$1.50 net.

THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAL IN THE MINISTRY. The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in the year 1908. By William Herbert Perry Faunce, President of Brown University. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pages vi + 286. Price \$1.25 net.

Both of these books belong to the department of homiletics. The first contains the substance of lectures that have been used in the classroom; so we infer from the systematic outline and completeness of the treatise as well as from the title. The material is divided into three parts: (1) "The Person," (2) "The Message," (3) "The Method." Each part has a number of chapters bringing out the principal phases of the main theme. The order of treatment is presumably the order of relative importance of the factors in effective preaching—the man, the message, the method. "A sermon is a real deed. It puts the preacher's personality into an act." Special stress is laid on the development of the preacher himself—his personality, his physical, intellectual and spiritual life. The message becomes powerful only when it is a personal experience and is adapted to living issues. The author deplores the methods of the "sensational pulpit with its worldly standards of immediate and tabulated results." He pleads for a "spiritual service tested by spiritual measures and motives." He advocates "an instructive pulpit that comes from the growing knowledge of the Gospel and of life, and results in a stable, balanced and comprehensive Christianity."

At the opening of each chapter there is a scheme of treatment and a citation of references. The one enables the reader to comprehend the argument more readily, and the other to become acquainted with the best and latest homiletical treatises in the English language. The author has evidently read widely, and has enriched his argument with quotations from the great preachers and teachers of the ages. The perusal of the book will not merely stir up the mind by way of remembrance, but will bring new aspects of truth to the reader's attention. It will teach the young preacher "how to receive and give the Word of God"; it will "brighten the ideal and renew the creative impulse" of the old preacher.

The lectures by Dr. Faunce were prepared for delivery from the platform and originally used as the "Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale University in March, 1908." Afterwards they were repeated in modified form as the "Earl Lectures" at the Pacific Theological Seminary of Berkeley, California. The author's purpose is, therefore, not to present a systematic work on preaching adapted for use in the classroom. Both in form and substance the lectures are designed to give a point of view, and to inspire confidence in the mission and work of the preacher.

He speaks of four conceptions of the ministry—the liturgical, the magisterial, the oratorical and the educational. "They have not always appeared in the same order of succession. They may, and often do, coexist in the same community. There is some truth in each one." As the title of the book implies, the author aims to show the advantage and efficiency of the educational ideal in the ministry. This he believes to have been the original method of the Church for the propagation of the Gospel. "In the days when in Europe the Church was officially in control of all human affairs, it planted Christian schools in every land. In America it founded nearly all our earliest colleges. The mottoes of these colleges—*Christo et Ecclesiae, Lux ac Veritas, In Deo Speramus*—show clearly the spirit in which they were established. But the chief educational work of the Church can never be done by reaching a few through formal schools and curricula, but must be done in and through its regular services and functions."

He is careful to define his conception of an educational ministry so as to distinguish it from the "old didactic and scholastic methods from which we have happily escaped." We are not "to return to the doctrine and sermons of early New England, to make religion a mere course of lessons in theology, and offer dogmatism in place of devotion." "The task of the minister is to give the people an abiding sense of moral and spiritual values, to make them realize what is worth while. It is to give them some dominating conception of life and its meaning. It is to furnish some general standards that may reconcile and unify the scattered and conflicting insights of our complex and hurried civilization. It is to lift men to some mount of vision from which they may 'see life steadily and see it whole.'"

The chief value of these lectures is their point of view, their clear statement of the living problems which confront the minister and his people, their note of reality, and their inspiring optimism. The purpose of the author is not to give advice or to answer hard questions, but to enlarge the scope of vision and to start trains of original thought. A citation of the subjects of the several chapters will give the best idea of the contents. They are the following: "The Place of the Minister in Modern Life"; "The Attitude of Religious Leaders toward New Truth"; "Modern Uses of Ancient Scripture"; "The Demand for Ethical Leadership"; "The Service of Psychology"; "The Direction of Religious Education"; "The Relation of the Church and the College"; "The Education of the Minister by his Task."

We are especially pleased with the chapters on "The Attitude of Religious Leaders toward New Truth," and on "The Relation of the Church and the College." Every minister would do well to become acquainted with the views of Dr. Faunce on these subjects.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

LUTHER'S EPISTLE SERMONS. Advent and Christmas Season, Vol. I. Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost, Vol. II. Trinity Sunday to Advent, Vol. III. (The three volumes are Volumes VII., VIII. and IX. of Luther's Complete Works.) Translated, with the help of others, by Professor John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Minneapolis, Minn., U. S. A., The Luther Press. 1909. Price \$2.25 per volume.

More than a year has elapsed since the last volume in the series of Luther's Complete Works in English, entitled "Luther on Christian Education," has been issued by the Luther Press. Of paramount importance for an intelligent study of Luther's work and of evangelical Protestantism, are his sermons on the Gospels and Epistles of the Church Year. The former have been published complete in five volumes; the latter are now before us complete in three volumes. Professor Lenker wisely began the publication of Luther's works in English with the sermons and the catechisms, for in these the principles of the Reformation and the doctrines of the Gospel are presented in such a way as to appeal to the people as well as to scholars. The books in English translation are an invaluable addition to the sermonic, catechetical, and devotional literature of the English churches.

The Epistle Sermons, coming from Luther, have a peculiar interest. As is well known to those who follow the pericopal system, the epistole lessons are intended to set forth the spiritual aspects of the work of redemption—Christ *in* His followers; while the gospel lessons present the historical facts of redemption—Christ *with* His followers. Thus the objective and subjective processes in salvation are constantly kept before the congregation so as to cultivate a normal and a balanced Christian life. No one is better qualified, by reason of his religious experience, to interpret the Epistles than the Wittenberg monk. He repeated in his own life the struggles of the great apostle to the Gentiles. His insight into the spirit of the Word comes not alone from his scholarship, but also from his personal experience of the grace of God and his knowledge of the conditions and needs of the common man. Penetrating, as he does, to the essence of the Gospel, his sermons have a perennial freshness, and usually touch the practical issues of our age. The form of religious and social problems may change, but in principle they are the same. It is true, too, that his interpretations of many a single passage may no longer be acceptable, but his spirit and method may still be followed with profit.

In reading a number of the sermons selected at random from the three volumes, the writer was impressed by several notable characteristics which preachers might do well to emulate. The simplicity of the language at once attracts the attention of the reader. There is no sign of theological pedantry, nor is there any attempt at philosophic profundity. Luther is true to a description which at one time he gave of his own preaching. "When I

preach, I descend to the level of the audience; I regard neither doctors nor masters, of which there are in the church above forty; but I have an eye to the multitude of young people, children and servants, of which there are more than two thousand. I preach to them."

He also shows himself master of the textual and expository method. He is a teacher all the time and yet has the glow and warmth of the preacher and the enthusiasm of the prophet. A number of recent books on preaching, by English and American authors, lay special stress on the importance of reviving expository preaching. We believe that their admonition is timely. The preacher and student can find no better model of this type of sermonizing than the Postils of the great Reformer.

One is astounded at the mastery of the Scriptures which appears on every page. Luther is saturated with the Word of God. The sermons abound with scriptural quotations and allusions taken from every book of the Bible. Thirty-four biblical passages, for example, are found in the Christmas Sermon; sixteen in the sermon for Trinity Sunday. The texts are not mechanically collated, but spontaneously take their place in the argument to illuminate and strengthen it. How well the Bible may be explained in its own light will appear to every intelligent reader of these sermons.

Homiletical helps are coming from the press like leaves from the autumn trees. Many of them are of doubtful value. We feel convinced however that the preacher will find the reading of these sermons helpful in his ministry. It is impossible to copy Luther; but he suggests ideas, starts trains of thought, and gives spiritual insight into the Scriptures which must enrich a preacher's life and doctrine. With profit, indeed, could a layman read one of these sermons Sunday after Sunday until he completes the Gospels and Epistles of the Church Year. It would take less time and probably bring far better results than reading the twentieth part of a Sunday newspaper.

We congratulate Professor Lenker on the completion of the translation of this monumental sermonic work, which ranks in many respects second to none in the history of Christian preaching, and is one of the most important contributions to Protestantism by the Wittenberg Reformer. GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

RECENT CHRISTIAN PROGRESS. Studies in Christian Thought and Work during the last Seventy-five Years. By Professors and Alumni of Hartford Theological Seminary in celebration of its Seventy-fifth Anniversary, May 24-26, 1909. Edited by Lewis Bayles Paton. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pages xvi + 593. Price \$3.00 net.

This volume contains a collection of eighty-three brief studies on the progress of the last seventy-five years in Christian thought and work. It was planned by the trustees and faculty of Hart-

ford Theological Seminary as an appropriate memorial of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of that institution. The scope of subjects discussed is coextensive with the five departments of the theological curriculum. The articles were written by "Professors, ex-Professors, Fellows, Alumni, and Trustees of the Seminary." It is the purpose of each writer to show the advance that has been made in his particular branch of study since the beginning of the seminary. For example, in the paper on "The History of the Early Church" Professor Williston Walker describes the new sources which have been discovered and the light which they have shed on early Christian history. Notable among these are the Seven Ignatian Epistles in their shorter Greek form, which are now generally accepted as authentic and as coming from the first quarter of the second century, "The Preaching of the Twelve Apostles" discovered in 1883 by Bryennios, the complete text of "Clement to the Corinthians" recovered in 1875, the greater part of the writings of Hippolytus accessible only since 1842, and the work of Irenaeus on "Apostolic Preaching" found so late as 1907. He also discusses the change of method in the treatment of church history from Mosheim to Ritschl and his school. Thus in the space of eight pages we have a clear outline of the history of church history of the last three quarters of a century. A similar plan is followed in each of the eighty-three articles, all of them necessarily brief but compact and helpful.

The articles are grouped under the following headings: (1) Preliminary Studies, 3 articles; (2) Old Testament, 6 articles; (3) New Testament, 7 articles; (4) Church History, 5 articles; (5) Systematic Theology, 12 articles; (6) Modern Churches, 9 articles; (7) Church Work, 12 articles; (8) Allied Agencies, 13 articles; (9) Home Missions, 4 articles; (10) Foreign Missions, 12 articles.

It is a significant fact that the greater proportion of articles come under the department of practical theology, nearly one half of the volume and fifty articles. The index is of special value in a book of this kind for the use of the data coming from so many different sources. The work as a whole is an appropriate commemoration of one of America's most influential schools, and is its own best testimony to the quality of the men it has reared and the scholarship it has cultivated.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

MODERN CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHERS. Selections Illustrating Modern Philosophy from Bruno to Spencer. Compiled by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D., Harvard University. New York, Houghton, Mifflin Co. 1908. Pages viii + 733. Price \$2.50 net.

The purpose of this work is so clearly and compactly stated by the compiler in the first two paragraphs of the preface, that we can do no better than to submit them to the reader verbatim:

"*Modern Classical Philosophers* aims to present in a series of extracts some of the essential features of the chief philosophical systems produced by the great philosophers from Bruno to Spencer. The book is virtually a history of modern philosophy based not upon the customary description of systems, but upon selections from original texts, and upon translations of the authors themselves. The attempt has been made to apply the case system, which has proved so successful in the teaching of law, to philosophical instruction. In this respect the work follows the model of the author's earlier publication in economic history, which was printed as a text-book of required reading to accompany courses of lectures given on that subject in different universities. It is likewise hoped to provide the general reader with a volume from which he may readily discover the content and method of the great philosophical masters of the modern period.

"Beginning with Bruno, the philosophical martyr, the dialogue which appears in this work is one in which the author describes the unity and divine immanence in all things in the universe, thereby anticipating the doctrine of Spinoza. From Bacon has been selected an account of 'the idols' or false notions which hinder men from a right pursuit of scientific research, and of the theory of induction by which they may advance in a true interpretation of nature. The passages from Hobbes contain his doctrine of the natural state of man as one of war, and of the necessity of 'that great Leviathan,' whereby peace and order may be established in the political commonwealth. Of Descartes, a part of the *Discourse on Method* is printed first, since it contains his intellectual autobiography and his peculiar principles of method for the attainment of truth; a transition is then made to his *Meditations on First Philosophy*, to set forth the application of his method of doubt to the discovery of absolute certainty, and also his attempt to demonstrate the existence of God. From *The Ethics* of Spinoza are given the doctrines of his one eternal substance and the immanent cause of the universe, of his three kinds of cognition, and of his intellectual love of God. The *Monadology* of Leibnitz is reproduced in full. Of Locke, will be found the refutation of the existence of innate ideas and principles, illustrative chapters tracing the sources of all our knowledge to sensation, and reflection, and a statement of the resultant extent and reality of human knowledge. Berkeley's idealism, it was believed, could be better learned by reproducing at some length his *Principles of Human Knowledge* than by numerous extracts from his various other writings. The philosophical significance of Hume in this work is based on his doctrine that causality owes its origin to habit, and on the consequent scepticism due to the limitation of the causal idea to the realm of experience. The French philosophy of the eighteenth century finds here its representative

in Condillac, whose work on the *Treatise of Sensations* contains the noted description of the endowment of a marble statue with the different senses of man in succession. Since the critical philosophy of Kant may appropriately be regarded as the high-water mark of modern philosophy, an effort has been made to give an extended outline of his system through selections as drawn from the *Critique of Pure Reason* and the *Critique of Practical Reason*. By extracts from some of their most important treatises, Fichte's subjective idealism, Schelling's objective idealism, and Hegel's absolute idealism, are set forth with sufficient clearness, it is believed, to enable the student to gain some just appreciation of these great doctrines. A section on 'Faith' from the *Vocation of Man* by Fichte, and a chapter on 'The Contrite Consciousness' from the *Phenomenology* of Hegel, may serve to illustrate the noble and inspiring thought to be found in German philosophy apart from its system-building. The spirited writing of Schopenhauer, with its deep keynote of pessimism, and its fine exaltation of art, is taken from his principal work on *The World as Will and Idea*. From Comte, the founder of positivism, has been chosen the chapter in which he expounds the nature and importance of the positive philosophy. Possibly Mill may not be regarded by many as strictly in the rank of classical philosophers, but it must be admitted by all that the theory, here reproduced, of the belief in matter as dependent upon the permanent possibilities of sensations constitutes a classical chapter in the history of modern philosophy. Spencer's doctrine of 'The Unknowable' is very briefly presented in harmony with his apparent intention of merely paving the way for an exposition of 'The Knowable.' With the statement of this philosophy of the knowable and with Spencer's far-reaching law of evolution, this volume concludes."

In the nature of the case only comparatively small sections of the writings of the several philosophers can be incorporated in a single volume. The abstracts, however, are of sufficient length to give the reader the salient points of the system under discussion. For example, thirty-four pages are devoted to Bacon, forty-four to Hobbes, forty-seven to Descartes, fifty to Spinoza and one hundred and ten to Kant. The material is selected by specialists so as to bring out the essential points in each system, and to enable the student to form an intelligent idea of the view-point and method of the author. While the book is a compilation, it is a valuable aid to the student who is attending lectures on modern philosophy and desires collateral reading. It ought to stimulate in the reader a taste for original research and spur him on to a perusal of at least some of the complete works of the classical philosophers.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE BOOK OF CHRISTMAS. With an Introduction by Hamilton W. Mabie, and an accompaniment of drawings by George Wharton Edwards. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pages xix + 369. Price \$1.25 net.

Both in its form and contents *The Book of Christmas* is a work of art. It has no sign of the cheapness, haste, and fragmentariness of books of this sort which are too frequently put on the market to catch an undiscriminating public a few weeks before the festival season. The Introduction, by Hamilton W. Mabie, will at once commend the work as worthy of recognition. In a delightful way he writes of the subtle and persistent charm which Christmas has over young and old, rich and poor, and all classes and conditions of men. "Even in this age of hard-hearted, practical sagacity and hard-minded goodness, ruthlessly bent on doing the Lord's work by methods of a police magistrate, Christmas carols are still sung; and the organization of virtue in numberless societies, with presidents and secretaries, and above all with treasurers, has not dimmed the glow of the love which bears fruit in a forest of Christmas trees with mobs of merry children shouting around them." We cannot escape its influence, try as we may. "This large hospitality of the Christmas fire before which kings and beggars sit at ease, and every human faculty finds its place, makes room for every gift and grace; for Reason with severe and wrinkled face; for Sentiment, tender and reverent of all sweet and beautiful things; for the imagination, seeing heavenly visions, and the fancy catching glimpses of quaint or grotesque or fairy-like images in the flame."

The book contains selections of Christmas prose and poetry, carols and hymns, stories and legends, customs and romances. These are drawn from the classic literature of western Europe and America. The material is grouped under the following headings: (1) "Signs of the Season," (2) "Holiday Saints and Lords," (3) "Christmas Customs and Beliefs," (4) "Christmas Carols," (5) "Christmas Day," (6) "Christmas Hymns," (7) "Christmas Revels," (8) "When All the World is King," (9) "Christmas Stories," (10) "New Year," (11) "Twelfth Night—Epiphany," (12) "The Christmas Spirit."

Twelve plates of the Christmas paintings of the great masters are scattered through the volume. Among the subjects are "The Holy Night," by Correggio; "The Virgin Adoring the Infant," by Correggio; "The Madonna," by Murillo; "The Holy Family with the Shepherds," by Titian; "The Madonna della Sedia," by Raphael, and "The Adoration of the Magi," by Paolo Veronese.

It is a book that one will enjoy reading during the Christmas season, either in the solitude of his room or perhaps surrounded by his family; now a story, now a carol, now a poem, all of them masterpieces of their kind and sanctified by centuries of use as well as signed by the geniuses of modern literature. For Christ-

mas entertainments, or rich memory gems, for the cultivation of finer feelings, higher ideals and a truer appreciation of the spiritual meaning of the holy season, one will find invaluable material in this collection. As a gift book it cannot be too highly commended.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE EDUCATION OF THE WILL. By Jules Payot, Litt.D., Ph.D., Rector of Academy of Aix, France. New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company. 1909. Cloth. Pages 424. Price \$1.50 net.

The value of a book like this is correctly appraised by the number of editions that are required to satisfy popular demands for it. This translation of the work has been made from the thirtieth French edition, and the importance of its suggestions and conclusions entitles it to a correspondingly wide attention among English readers. The author is one of the foremost educators of France, whose contentions based as they are upon sound psychological principles and laws, will afford instruction and guidance to those who are responsible for the education of the young, no less than for those who are interested in the theory and practice of self-culture. Both these classes will find the several chapters of the book illuminating and suggestive, and, notwithstanding the many profound questions of mental and moral life that are dealt with, written throughout in a style that is as admirably clear and understandable as it is beautiful and engaging.

The volume opens with an interesting discussion of the hindrances that must be met and overcome by those that would give the proper and possible education to the will. Birth, heredity and environment are recognized as having somewhat of determining significance in moral training, but he shows that under the application of available psychological laws, the will may be educated so as to serve the ends of forming, developing and strengthening character to the highest and noblest degree. In a manner that is perfectly sane and sound, he points out the relations to such training of athletic exercise, of intellectual application, of bodily hygiene, of eating and drinking, of social relations, and of habits of industrious effort. In a most forceful way he sets forth also the joys that attend earnest work in school-days as well as in spheres of active industrial, commercial, or professional life, afterwards, and discusses the ministry of good historic, biographic, and imaginative literature, in the training of the moral and spiritual side of our being.

In its own department, Professor Payot's treatise is really a masterpiece, the study of which by older and younger persons must bring large and uplifting rewards to them. It will suggest new methods for the deepening and enrichment of character. It will carry inspirational power for the higher and nobler thinking,

and for increased effort to make the best of life and its opportunities. It will reveal the highest Christian standards of personal conduct, and stimulate the motives that are essential to press on toward the fuller achievement of the loftiest ideals of intelligent and ethical manhood. The book is well worth place in every home where there are young men, in libraries of churches and schools, and on the study-table of every young minister of the Gospel.

A. S. WEBER.

THE EDUCATION OF THE WILL. By T. Sharper Knowlson. Philadelphia, Pa., J. B. Lippincott Company. 1909. Cloth. Pages 210. Price \$1.50 net.

Bearing the same title as the work just noticed and intended in a general way to serve the same ends, this volume by the author of *The Art of Thinking* is wholly different from that of the genial Frenchman in the material of its content and in the spirit of its discussions. On the title-page one finds Dr. Royce quoted as saying in his *Outlines of Psychology* that "the proper moulding of the will is, indeed, in one sense, the goal of all education," but the goal of the author's purpose in these chapters seems restricted to the consideration of questions suggested by or connected with phases of thought known to-day as Christian science, mental healing, telepathy, spiritism, auto-suggestion, etc. The author is not a mean psychologist. He is widely acquainted with the literature of psychical research, and discusses the relation of the will to the varied phenomena of current speculations regarding disease and healing, spirit manifestation and transfer of thought, as well as its power acting through suggestion in dealing with the training of "backward" children, with moral "defectives," and with the criminal and insane. He shows that the influence of the adequately trained will is one of great depth and wide range, and that the knowledge of it opens up a large field of fruitful investigation and discussion.

In the chapter which is devoted to the study of "the psychology of the will," the great mystery of the human force known to us as mind receives careful attention, and two things are specially emphasized: (1) That the mystery is not at all relieved, it is rather deepened, by saying that mind is a function of the brain, for the difficulty of explaining how matter becomes conscious remains. (2) That mind is a unity, and that the division of it, as formerly made by psychologists, into three sections—feeling, intellect and will—has been superseded. "To read of such divisions nowadays, brings to mind," Mr. Knowlson observes, "the saying, 'the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.' An act of will was regarded as an absolutely different operation from an act of thought; reason was indeed in some quarters, the pulpit

especially, feared as an enemy to truth—one we should have no dealings with—rather ought we to follow feeling which masqueraded in the guise of heart. This old psychology was one of the little systems which have their day and cease to be. Mental faculties are no longer looked upon as faculties engaged in civil war among themselves; they are orderly manifestations of one great whole." This needs to be remembered in considering will-power, for it embraces imagination, suggestion, sympathy, and other mental phenomena.

The sections of the book which deal with the relations of mind and body, and of will-power and the development of character, constitute perhaps the most important parts of the book. They disclose the author's special equipment for the task he is seeking to perform, and the success of his performance will be generally acknowledged by those privileged to accompany him through his discussions. In an appendix, the contents of which will be interesting to many, formulæ of auto-suggestion are given and discussed. One of these formulæ has to do with insomnia, another with the "cigarette mania," another with dipsomania, and still another with stage fright. These suggestions are only one illustration of the practical ends the book throughout seeks to subserve, and every reader will find not a little in its pages that is informing and helpful.

A. S. WEBER.

THOSE NERVES. By George Lincoln Walton, M.D. Philadelphia, Pa., J. B. Lippincott Company. 1909. Cloth. Pages 204. Price \$1.00 net.

The title of the book may seem somewhat light and trifling, but the character and purpose of its contents are serious and important. Its author is a learned and widely-known physician, and the consulting neurologist to the Massachusetts General Hospital. In an earlier book on *Why Worry?* he won distinction as an able writer on nervous disorders, and the present discussion will add to reputation. "The purpose of the book," his preface tells us, "is in line with the present trend in favor of treating, or, preferably, of preventing, mental disorders by mental methods." When it is recalled that many thousands in every state are the victims of such disorders, and that their numbers are constantly increasing, the expert information of a book like this should be heartily welcomed, and carefully studied, by ministers of the Gospel no less than by physicians. It aims to acquaint men with the causes that lead to the disease of "those nerves," which mean "the brain," to point out faulty mental habits that ought to be dissipated, and to present methods and rational grounds for renewed endeavors to gain control of rebellious nerves. Were it possible to give general currency to knowledge such as Dr. Walton has put into these pages, a vast deal of mental suffering might be alleviated, and a vaster deal entirely avoided. The book deserves the widest possible circulation.

A. S. WEBER.